A DISCOVRSE CONCERNING THE TRVE NOTION OF THE LORDS SVPPER.

By R. Culworth.

LONDON,
Printed for *Richard Cotes*. 1642.

The Chapters of the following TREATISE.

CHAP. I.

THat it was a Custome among the Jewes and Heathens, to Feast upon things Sacrificed, and that the Custome of the Christians, in Partaking of the Body and Bloud of Christ, once Sacrificed upon the Crosse, in The Lords Supper, is Analogicall hereunto. Page 3.

CHAP. II.

An Objection taken from the Passeover, Answered. Proved, that The Passeover was a True Sacrifice, and The Paschall-Feast, a Feast upon a Sacrifice: From Scripture, and Jewish Authors. pag. 16.

CHAP. III.

An Answer to some Objections against the Passeovers being a Sacrifice. And the Controversie about the Day, upon which the Jewes kept the Passeover, about the time of Our Saviours death, Discussed. Proved against Scaliger *and others of that Opinion, that no Translations of Feasts, from one Feria to another, were then in use.*

CHAP. IV.

Demonstrated, that the Lords Supper in the Christian Church, in reference to the True Sacrifice of Christ, is a Parallel to the Feasts upon Sacrifices, both in the Jewish Religion, and Heathenish Superstition. pag. 52.

CHAP. V.

The Result of the former Discourse. That the Lords Supper is not a Sacrifice, but a Feast upon a Sacrifice. pag. 54.

CHAP. VI.

The further Improvement of that Generall Notion. How The Lords Supper is a Federall Rite betweene God and us, at large. Concluded with a memorable Story out of Maymonides *and* Nachmanides. pag. 56.

THE

THE TRVE NOTION OF THE LORDS SVPPER.

ALL great Errours have ever been intermingled with ſome Truth. And indeed, if Falſhood ſhould appeare alone unto the world in her owne true Shape and native Deformity, ſhe would be ſo blacke and horrid, that no man would looke upon her; and therefore ſhe hath alwayes had an Art to wrap her ſelfe up in a Garment of Light, by which meanes ſhe paſſes freely diſguiſed and undiſcerned. This was elegantly ſignified in the Fable thus; Truth at firſt preſented her ſelfe to the world, and went about to ſeeke entertainment, but when ſhe found none, being of a Generous nature, that loves not to obtrude

trude her ſelfe upon unworthy ſpirits, ſhe reſolved to leave earth, and take her flight for Heaven, but as ſhe was going up, ſhe chanced, *Eliah*-like, to let her Mantle fall, and Falſhood waiting by for ſuch an opportunity, ſnatch'd it up preſently, and ever ſince goes about diſguiſed in Truths attire.

Pure Falſhood is pure Non-Entity, and could not ſubſiſt alone by it ſelf, wherfore it alway twines up together about ſome Truth παραφυάδος ἐχὸς, as *Athenagoras* the Chriſtian Philoſopher ſpeakes, like an Ivy that growes upon ſome Wall, twining her ſelfe into it with wanton and flattering embraces, till it have at length deſtroyed and pul'd downe that which held it up. There is alway ſome Truth which gives Being to every Errour: *Eſt quædam Veritatis Anima, qua Corpus omnium Errorum agitat & informat:* There is ever ſome Soule of Truth, which doth ſecretly Spirit and Enliven the dead and unweildy Lump of all Errours, without which it could not move or ſtirre.

In Orat. De Reſurrect. Mort.

Though ſomtimes it would require a very curious Artiſt, in the midſt of all Errours Deformities, to deſcry the defaced lineaments of that Truth which firſt it did reſemble: as *Plutarch* ſpake ſometime of thoſe Ægyptian Fables of *Iſis* and *Oſiris*, that they had ἀμυδρὰς τινας ἐμφάσεις τ ἀληθείας, certaine weake apparences and glimmerings of Truth, but ſo as that they needed λυτῆ ἰχνηλατῆ, ſome notable Diviner to diſcover them.

Lib. De Iſide & Oſiride.

And this I thinke is the caſe of that Grand Errour of the Papiſts, concerning *the Lords Supper being a Sacrifice:* which perhaps at firſt did riſe by Degeneration from a Primitive Truth, whereof the very

very Obliquity of this Errour yet may beare ſome dark and obſcure intimation. Which wil beſt appear when we have firſt diſcovered the *True Notion of the Lords Supper*, whence we ſhall be able at once to convince the Errour of this Popiſh Tenet, and withall to give a juſt account of the firſt Riſe of it:

Veritas Index ſui & obliqui.

CHAP. I.

THe Right *Notion* of that Chriſtian Feaſt called *The Lords Supper*, in which we eate and drinke the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, that was once offered up in Sacrifice to God for us; is to be derived (if I miſtake not) from Analogy to that ancient Rite amongſt the Jewes of *Feaſting upon things Sacrificed*, and eating of thoſe things which they had offered up to God.

For the better conceiving whereof, we muſt firſt conſider a little, how many kinds of Jewiſh Sacrifices there were, and the Nature of them. Which although they are very well divided, according to the received opinion, into foure, עולה. חטאת. אשם. שלמים: The Burnt-offering, the Sinne-offering, the Treſpaſſe-offering, and the Peace-offering. Yet perhaps I may make a more Notionall Diviſion of them, for our uſe, into theſe three *ſpecies*.

Firſt, ſuch as were wholly offered up to *God*, and burnt upon the Altar, which were the *Holocauſts*, or *Burnt-offerings*.

Secondly, ſuch wherein beſides ſomething offe-

red up to *God* upon the Altar, the *Priests* had also a part to eate of. And these are subdivided into the *Sinne-offerings*, and the *Trespasse-offerings*.

* Concerning the difference betweene these two, see *Petite* in his *Variæ Lectiones*.

Thirdly, such, as in which, besides Something offered up to *God*, and a Portion bestowed on the *Priests*, The *Owners* themselves had a share likewise: and these were called שלמים, or *Peace-offerings*, which contained in them, as the Jewish Doctors speak, חלק לשם וחלק לכהן וחלק לבעל, a Portion for *God*, and the *Priests*, and the *Owners* also; and thence they use to give the Etymon of the Hebrew word *Shelamim* שלמים, כי זה הובח שלום ביניהם. Because these Sacrifices brought Peace to the Altar, the Priests, and the Owners, in that every one of these had a share in them.

Now for the first of these, although (perhaps to signifie some speciall Mystery concerning Christ) they were themselves wholly offered up to God, and burnt upon the Altar; yet they had ever Peace-offerings regularly annexed to them when they were not קרבנות ציבור, *Offerings for the whole Congregation*, but for any particular persons, that so the Owners might at the same time when they offered up to God, feast also upon the Sacrifices.

And for the second, although the Owners themselves did not eate of them, the reason whereof was, because they were not perfectly reconciled to God, being for the present in a state of guilt, which they made atonement for in these Sacrifices, yet they did it by the Priests who were their Mediators unto God, and as their Proxies, did eate of the Sacrifices for them.

But

But in the Peace-offerings, because such as brought them had no uncleanneſſe upon them, (*Levit.* 7. 20.) and so were perfectly reconciled to God, and in covenant with him; therefore they were in their owne persons to eate of those Sacrifices, which they had offered unto God, as a Federall Rite betweene God and them, which we shall explaine at large hereafter.

So then, the Eating of the Sacrifices, was a due and proper *appendix* unto all Sacrifices, one way or other, and either by the Priests, or themselves, when the person that offered was capable thereof. Wherfore we shall find in the Scripture, that Eating of the Sacrifices, is brought in continually as a Rite belonging to Sacrifice in generall. Which we will now shew in divers instances. *Exod.* 34. 15. God commands the Jewes, that when they came into the Land of *Canaan*, they should destroy the Altars, and Images, and all the Monuments of Idolatry among those Heathens, giving the reason thus. *Lest thou make a Covenant with the Inhabitants of the Land, and they goe a whoring after their Gods, and doe Sacrifice unto their Gods, and one call thee, and thou EATE of their Sacrifice:* Which indeed afterward came thus to passe, *Numb.* 25. 2. *They called the people to the Sacrifice of their Gods, and the people did EATE, and bow downe to their Gods*; or as it is cited in *Psal.* 106. *they joyned themselves unto* Baal-peor, *and ATE the Sacrifice of the dead.* When *Jethro*, *Mose's* Father in Law came to him, *Exod.* 18. 12. *He tooke a Burnt-offering and Sacrifices for God, and* Aaron *came, and all the Elders of Israel TO EATE BREAD be-*

fore the Lord, by Sacrifices there, are meant Peace-offerings, as *Aben-Ezra*, and the *Targum*, well expound it, which we said before were regularly joyned with Burnt-offerings: So *Exod.* 31. When the Israelites worshipped the golden Calfe, the Text saith that *Aaron built an Altar before it, and made a Proclamation, saying, To morrow is a* FEAST *unto the Lord*, (see how the Altar and the Feast were a kinne to one another) *And they rose up early in the morning, and brought Burnt-offerings and offered Peace-offerings, and the people* SATE DOWNE TO EATE AND DRINKE. Which passage Saint *Paul* makes use of, being about to dehort the Corinthians from eating things sacrificed to Idols, 1 *Cor.* 10. *Neither be you Idolaters as some of them were, as it is written, The People* SATE DOWNE TO EATE AND DRINKE: for this was no common Eating, but the Eating of those Sacrifices which had beene offered up to the golden Calfe.

The first of *Sam.* 1. It is said of *Elkanah, that he went up out of his City yearely to worship, and to Sacrifice to the Lord of Hosts in* Shiloh: *and when the time was come that he offered, he gave to* Peninnah *his wife, and to all her Sons and Daughters* PORTIONS, *and unto* Hannah *he gave a double* PORTION: that is, *Portions to eate, of those Sacrifices that had been offered up to God*, as *R. David Kimchy* notes. And in the eight Chapter of the same booke, when *Saul* was seeking *Samuel*, going towards the City, he met some maidens, that told him, *Samuel* was come to the City, for there was a Sacrifice for the people that day in the High-place: *As soone* (say they) *as you come into*

the

the City you shall finde him before he goe up to the High-place T O E A T E, *for the people will not* E A T E *untill he come, because he doth blesse the Sacrifice:* Where though the word *Bamah* properly signifie a High-place, or place of Sacrifice, whence the Greek word Βῶμος is thought to be derived. Yet it is here rendred by the *Targum*, as often elsewhere, בית אסתורותא *Domus Accubitus, A house of feasting*, because feasting and sacrificing were such generall Concomitants of one another. So againe in the 16. Chap. *Samuel* went to *Bethlehem* to anoint *David: I am come* (saith he) *to sacrifice to the Lord, sanctifie your selves, and come with me to the Sacrifice*; but when he understood that *Jesse's* youngest sonne was absent, he saith to *Jesse, Send and fetch him, for we will not* S I T D O W N E *untill he come.* So I understand that of the Sichemites, according to the judgement of the Jewish Doctors, *Judg. 9. They went into the house of their God, and did* E A T E *and* D R I N K E, *and cursed Abimelech*; that is, they went into the house of their God to Sacrifice, and did eate and drinke of the Sacrifice: which perhaps was the reason of the name by which they called their God, whom they thus worshipped, B E R I T H, which signifies a Covenant, because they worshiped him by this Federall Rite of eating of his Sacrifices, of which more hereafter. Thus likewise the Hebrew Scholiasts expound that in the 16. Chapter of the same Booke Verse 23. concerning the Philistims when they had put out *Sampsons* eyes. *They met together to offer a great Sacrifice unto Dagon their God, and* T O R E J O Y C E, that is, in Feasting upon the Sacrifices.

Hence

Hence it is that the Idolatry of the Jewes in worshipping other Gods, is so often described synecdochically under the Notion of Feasting. *Isa.* 56. 7. *Upon a lofty and high mountaine hast thou* SETTHY BED, *and thither wentest thou up to offer Sacrifice*; for in those ancient times they were not wont to sit at feasts, but lie downe on beds or couches. *Ezek.* 23. *You sent for men from farre, Sabeans from the Wilderneſſe*, (i. e. *Idolatrous Priests from Arabia*) *and loe they came, for whom thou didst wash thy selfe, and sattest upon a stately* BED, *with a* TABLE *prepared before thee. Amos* 2. *verse* 8. *They laid themselves downe upon clothes laid to pledge by every Altar*: i. e. laid themselves downe to eate of the Sacrifice that was offered on the Altar. And in *Ezek.* 18. 11. Eating upon the Mountaines seemes to be put for Sacrificing upon the Mountaines, because it was a constant appendix to it. *He that hath not done any of these things, but hath even* EATEN *upon the Mountaines*, בהרים אכל *i. e.* Hath worshipped Idols upon the Mountaines, so the *Targum* renders it. Lastly, Saint *Paul* makes Eating of the Sacrifice a generall Appendix of the Altar, *Heb.* 12. *We have an Altar, whereof they have no right* TO EATE *that serve the Tabernacle.* I will observe this one thing more, because it is not commonly understood, that all the while the Jewes were in the Wilderneſſe, they were to Eate no meate at all at their private Tables, but that whereof they had first sacrificed to God at the Tabernacle. For this is clearely the meaning of that place, *Levit.* 17. *verse* 4, 5. *Whatsoever man there be in the house of Israel that killeth*

See *Casaub. Exercit. Eccles.* 16. 22.

Of *Saba* see *Salmasius in Plinianis Exercitat. p.* 497. & 500.

leth a Lamb, or a Goat, or an Oxe, within the Camp, or without the Camp, and bringeth it not to the door of the Tabernacle, to offer an offering to the Lord, bloud shall be imputed to him. And so *Nachmanides* there glosses according to the mind of the Ancient Rabbines, הנה מתחלה צוה שכל מה שהיו אוכלים שלמים *i. e. Behold God commanded at first that all which the Israelites did Eate should be Peace-offerings.* Which command was afterward dispensed with, when they came into the land, and their dwellings were become remote from the Tabernacle, so that they could not come up every day to sacrifice; *Deut.* 12. 20, 21. *If the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen, be too farre from thee, then thou shalt kill of the Heard and of the Flock, and thou shalt eate within thy gates whatsoever thy soule lusteth after.* Onely now there were instead thereof, three constant and set times appointed in the yeare, in which every male was to come up and See God at his Tabernacle, and eate and drinke before him: and the Sacrifice that was then offered, was wont to be called by them עולת ראייה *A Sacrifice of Seeing.*

Thus I have sufficiently declared the Jewish Rite of joyning Feasting with Sacrificing: and it will not be now amisse, if we adde as a *Mantissa* to that discourse something of the custome of the Heathens also in the like kinde, the rather because we may make some use of it afterward. And it was so generall amongst them in their idolatrous Sacrifices, that *Isaak Abravanel*, a learned Jew, observed it, in *Piruש Hattorah*, בימים קדמונים כל מי שהוא שוחט עבודת אלילים מיד היה שוחה עליה מכרה

Diebus antiquis quiſquis Idolis ſacrificabat, ſtatim convivium inſtruebat de ſacrificiis: and the Originall of it amongſt them was ſo ancient, that it is aſcribed by their owne Authors to *Prometheus*, as *Salmaſius* in his *Solino-Pliniane Exercitations* notes. *Hunc Sacrificii morem à Prometheo originem duxiſſe volunt, quo partem hoſtiæ in ignem conjicere ſoliti ſunt, partem ad ſuum victum abuti.* Which *Prometheus*, although according to *Euſebius* his *Chronicon*, and our ordinary Chronologers, his time would fall near about the 3028. year of the *Julian Period*, which was long after *Noah*. Yet it is certaine that he lived farre ſooner, neare about *Noahs* time, in that he is made to be the ſonne of *Japhet*, which was *Noahs* ſonne, from whom the Europæans deſcended, (*Gen.*10.5.) called therefore by the Poet *Japeti Genus*. For there is no great heed to be given to the Chronology of Humane writers concerning this age of the world, which *Cenſorinus* from *Varro* cals Μυθικὸν. Although I rather ſubſcribe to the judgement of the learned *Voſſius*, that this *Prometheus* was no other then *Noah* himſelfe, the Father of *Japhet*, and not his ſonne; becauſe the other things doe ſo well agree to him, & we may eaſily allow the Heathens ſuch a miſtake as that is, in a matter of ſo remote antiquity: and then if this be true, the whole world received this Rite of Feaſting upon Sacrifice, at firſt, together with that of Sacrifice, at the ſame time. Inſtances of this cuſtome are ſo frequent and obvious in Heathen Authors, that *Homer* alone were able to furniſh us ſufficiently.

P. 129. *a.*

Note that אִיִּים חַגְוֵי the Ilands of the Nations, is commonly uſed in Scripture as a Proper Name to expreſſe *Europe* by.

Lib. 1. *de Idol.*

In the ε of the *Iliads*, he brings in a deſcription of

a Hecatomb-Sacrifice, which *Agamemnon* prepared for *Apollo* by his Priest *Chryse*, and a Feast that followed immediatly after it: In $\overline{\beta}$ the same *Agamemnon* offers up an Oxe to *Jupiter*, and inviteth divers of the Grecian Captaines to partake of it: In the $\overline{\gamma}$ of the *Odysees*, *Nestor* makes a magnificent Sacrifice to *Neptune* of eighty two Bullocks, with a Feast upon it, on the shoare: In $\overline{\theta}$, *Alcinous* offers up a Bullock unto *Jupiter*, and then immediatly followes,

——Δαίνυτ' ἰσκυδία δαῖτα
Τερπόμενοι——

Plato in his second *De Legibus*, acknowledges these Feasts under the name of Ἑορταὶ μετὰ θεῖον, Feasts after Divine worship offered up to the Gods. Among the Latins, that of *Lycus* in *Plautus* his *Pœnulus* belongs to this purpose,

Convivas volo
Reperire vobis commodos qui unà sient,
Interibi attulerint exta.

And that of *Gelasimus* in *Stichus*,

Famne exta cocta sunt? quot agnis fecerat?

After this manner he in *Virgils Eclogs* invites his Friend.

Cum faciam vitula pro frugibus, ipse venito.

And thus *Evander* entertaines *ÆNEAS* in the eighth Ænead,

Tum lecti juvenes certatim, aræque Sacerdos,
Viscera tosta ferunt taurorum——

Plutarch ſomewhere obſerves it as a ſtrange and uncouth Rite, in the worſhip of the Goddeſſe *Hecate*, that they which offered Sacrifice unto her did not partake of it. And the ſame Author reports of *Cataline* and his Conſpiratours, Οτι καταδυσαντες ἄνθρωπον ἐγευσαντο ἀλλήλων σαρκῶν, *that ſacrificing a man, they did all eate ſomewhat of the fleſh*, uſing this Religious Rite as a Bond to confirme them together in their Treachery. But *Strabo* tels us of a ſtrange kind of worſhip uſed by the Perſians in their Sacrifices, where no part of the fleſh was offered up to the Gods, but all eaten up by thoſe that brought it, and their Gueſts, they ſuppoſing in the meane while, that whilſt they did eate of the Fleſh, their God which they worſhipped, had the Soule of the Sacrifice that was killed in honour to him. The Authors owne words are theſe in his fifteenth Booke, Μεείσαντος δὲ τῶ Μάγω τὰ κρέα τῶ ὑφηγεμόνι τ' ἱερουργίαν, ἀπαλῶν διελόμενοι· τοῖς θεοῖς ἐδὲν ἀπονείμαντες μέρος. Τῆς γὰρ ΨΥΧΗΣ φασι τῶ ἱερείω δεῖσθαι τ' θεὸν, ἄλλα δὲ ἐδενός. Ομως δὲ τῶ ἐπίπλω τ μηρὸν πθέασιν, ὡς λέγουσί τινες, ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ·—— *Suâ quiſque acceptâ abeunt, nullâ parte diis relatâ, dicunt enim Deum nihil velle præter hoſtiæ Animam: quidam tamen (ut fertur) omenti partem igni imponunt.*

From this Cuſtome of the Heathens of *Feaſting upon Sacrifices*, aroſe that Famous Controverſie among the Chriſtians in the Primitive Times, ſometime diſputed in the New Teſtament, Whether it were lawfull ΕΣΘΙΕΙΝ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΑ, To eate things ſacrificed to Idols.

Theſe Gentile Feaſts upon the Sacrifices, were uſually

usually kept in the Temple where the Sacrifice was offered; as may be gathered from that passage of *Herodotus* in *Clio*, where speaking of *Cleobus* and *Bithene*, and what hapned to them after that prayer which their Mother put up to the Gods for them, ὡς ἔθυσαν (saith he) καὶ ἐυωχήθησαν κατακοιμηθέντες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἱρῷ, &c. *As soone as they had sacrificed and feasted, lying downe to steepe in the same Temple, they dyed there, and never rose more.* But it is very apparent from that of Saint *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 8. *If any man see thee which hast knowledge, sit at meate,* ἐν εἰδωλείῳ, that is, not as *Erasmus* translates it, *In Epulo simulacrorum*, but as *Beza*, and from him our Interpreters, *In the Idols Temple*; for so both the *Syriack Metaphrast* expounds it ⟨Syriac⟩ and the *Arabick* ⟨Arabic⟩ *In the house of Idols.*

If any thing were left when these *Feasts* were ended, they were wont to carry Portions of them home to their Friends; So that learned Scholiast upon *Aristophanes* in *Plutus* tels us, οἱ γὰρ ἐκ θυσίας ἰόντες, ἔφερον ἐξ αὐτῆς τὰ θυσίας τοῖς οἰκείοις κατὰ νόμον πινά. Whence *Petite* in that excellent Collection of *Attick* Lawes, inserted this for one, *viz.* *That they that goe home from a Sacrifice should carry part of it to their friends.* And that Greeke Comedian himselfe alludeth there to it, in these words:

——— Τοῦτο δὲ τὸ κρεάδιον
Τῶν ἔνδοθέν τις ἐστὶ πεγκράτου λαβών.

Theocritus in his *Bucoliastes*, doth expresse it fully:

——— Καὶ τὰ δὲ θύσας
Ταῖς νύμφαις, Μόρσωνι καλὰν κρέας αὐτίκα πίμπλον.

And *Plautus* in *Miles*,

——— *Sacrificant?*
Dant inde partem majorem mihi quam ſibi.

Theſe Portions which they carried home, were called commonly by the Greekes μοῖραι, and in the Umbrian Language, as *Feſtus* tels us, *Strobula*. *Theophraſtus* in his Characters uſes the word νόμος in this ſenſe Καὶ θύοντας καὶ ἀναλίσκοντας ἥκειν τόμον ἀπαιτῶν. *ad ſacrificantes & epula concelebrantes accedit, ut inde Portionem auferat.*

Περὶ ἀκμωνείας.

And becauſe they thought they did receive ſome bleſſing from the Gods with it, therefore it was ſometime called ὑγίεια, as we finde in *Heſychius* upon that word. ὑγίεια, ἄλφιτα οἴνῳ καὶ ἐλαίῳ πεφυραμένα, καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἐκ θυσίᾳ φερόμενον, εἴτε μύρον, εἴτε σάλλος ἢ ὑγίεια.

But otherwiſe if there were any thing yet remaining, it belonged to the Prieſts, as we learne from that Scholiaſt, which we have already commended, upon *Veſpæ*; νόμος ἦν, τὰ ὑπολειπόμενα ἐκ θυσίας τὸς ἱερέας λαμβάνειν. *i. e. It was an ancient Law among the Athenians, that the Prieſts ſhould have the remainder.* Which is not onely to be underſtood of the skinne and ſuch like parts, but of the fleſh of the Sacrifice it ſelfe, as we learne from Saint *Auſtine* in his expoſition upon *Rom.* 2. who tels us alſo that theſe reliques were ſometimes ſold for them in the Market, whence that ſpeech of *Paul*, 1 *Corin.* 10. *Whatſoever is ſold in the ſhambles, Eate, asking no queſtion for conſcien ce ſake.*

I will ſhut up all, with this one obſervation more, that as we ſaid of the Jewes, that in the Wilderneſſe they

they did eate no meate, but of that which they had first sacrificed: In like manner the Heathens were wont to Sacrifice before all their Feasts: Whence it is that *Athenæus* observes, Feasts among the ancient Heathens were ever accounted Sacred and Religious things. And thus we must understand that speech of *Paul* in the 27. verse of the forenamed Chapter. *If any one that beleeves not, invite you, and you be disposed to goe, whatsoever is set before you, eate, asking no question for conscience sake.* Nay, it was accounted a prophane thing amongst them, to eate any meate at their private tables, whereof they had not first Sacrificed to the Gods, as appeareth by that Greeke Proverb, ἄθυτα ἔδειν, used by *Anacreon*, and others, as a Brand of a notorious wicked man, *viz. one that would eate meate whereof hee had not sacrificed.*

Now having thus shewne, that both amongst the *Jewes* under the Law, and the *Gentiles* in their Pagan worship, (for *Paganisme* is nothing but *Judaisme degenerate*) it was ever a Solemne Rite, to joyne *Feasting* with *Sacrificing*, and to *EATE of those things which had beene offered up*; The very Concinnity and Harmony of the thing it selfe, leads me to conceive, that that Christian Feast under the Gospel, called *THE LORDS SUPPER*, is the very same thing, and bears the same *Notion*, in respect of the true *Christian Sacrifice* of Christ upon the Crosse, that those did to the *Jewish* and *Heathenish Sacrifices*: and so is *EPULUM SACRIFICIALE*, *a Sacrificiall Feast*, I meane, a Feast upon Sacrifice; or *EPULUM EX OBLATIS*, A Feast *upon things offered* up to God. Onely this difference arising

ſing in the Parallel, that becauſe thoſe *Legall Sacrifices* were but Types and Shadowes of the true *Chriſtian Sacrifice*, they were often repeated and renewed, as well as the *Feaſts* which were made upon them: But now the True *Chriſtian Sacrifice* being come, and offered up once for all, never to be repeated; we have therefore no more Typicall *Sacrifices* left amongſt us, but onely the *Feaſts upon the True Sacrifice* ſtill Symbolically continued, and often repeated, in reference to that *ONE GREAT SACRIFICE*, which is alwayes as preſent in Gods ſight, and efficacious, as if it were but now offered up for us.

CHAP. II.

Object. BUT me thinkes I heare it objected to me, that *the true Notion* of the Lords Supper is to be derived rather from the *Paſſeover* among the Jewes: It being the common opinion of Divines, that the Jewes had but two *Sacraments*, viz. *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſeover*, that anſwer to thoſe two amongſt us, *Baptiſme*, and *The Lords Supper*: But the *Jewiſh Paſſeover* had no relation to a *Sacrifice*, being nothing elſe but a meere *FEAST*, and therefore from Analogy to the Jewiſh Rites, we cannot make the Lords Supper, to be *EPULUM SACRIFICIALE*, *a Feaſt upon Sacrifice.*

To which I anſwer, Firſt, That I know not what warrant there is for that Divinity ſo magiſterially

rially impoſed upon us by ſome, that the Jewes had but two *Sacraments*, *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſeover*, and that it ſhould thence follow by inevitable conſequence, that the *Lords Supper* muſt ἀντιτυπῶν, anſwer only to the *Jewiſh Paſſeover*; Sure I am, the Jewes had many more, for not to inſtance in that of *Paul*, *Our Fathers were all* B A P T I Z E D *unto Moſes in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, like our Chriſtian Baptiſme; *And did all* E A T E *the ſame Spirituall Meate*, (viz. The Manna) *and did all* D R I N K E *the ſame Spirituall drinke*, (viz. The Water of the Rock that followed them) like the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Chriſtian *Lords Supper*: Nor to Examine all the other Sacramentall Ceremonies which they had, that were almoſt as many *Sacraments* as *Ceremonies*; Theſe *Feaſts upon the Sacrifices*, which we have all this while inſiſted on, were nothing elſe but true and proper *Sacraments** joyned with *Sacrifices*.

* See *Cloppenburg in Schola Sacrif.* and of the right *Notion* of the word Sacrament, *Voſſius in Theſ. Theolog.*

But ſecondly, I will grant that the Jewiſh *Paſſeover*, hath a ſpeciall reſemblance to the Chriſtian *LORDS SUPPER*, although upon other grounds; For I ſay undoubtedly, the *Paſſeover* was a *true and proper Sacrifice*, and therefore the Paſcall-Feaſt, a *Feaſt upon a Sacrifice*; So that this ſhall ſtill advance and improve our former *Notion*.

For the better conceiving whereof, we muſt underſtand, that beſides thoſe foure Generall kinds of Sacrifices among the Jewes before mentioned, The *Burnt-offering*, The *Sin-offering*, The *Treſpaſſe-offering*, and the *Peace-offfering*; there were ſome other *Peculiar kind* of Sacrifices, as the Maſters tell us, *viz.* theſe three, בכורים ומעשר ופסח. The *Firſtlings of Caſtle*, and

the *Tenth*, and the *Passeover*; And the reason why these in the Distribution of Sacrifices, are thus distinguished by them from all the other Generall kind of Sacrifices, is thus given by the famous *Maymonides* upon the *Misna* of the *Talmud*, in *Massecheth Zebachim*, the sixth Chap. לפי שאותן הארבע פעמים רבות יתחייב היחיד בכל אחד מהם לפי שבני העניות והציבור ויביו בהם בזמנים ואלו אינם כן: *Because those foure fourenamed, were such kind of Sacrifices as that a private person was often bound to each of them in severall cases, and the whole Congregation in severall seasons, but these three were not of that nature, being peculiarly restrained to some one case or season.* Now, these three kind of *Peculiar Sacrifices*, were in their nature, all neereſt of kinne to the *Peace-offerings*, and are therefore called by the Jewish Doctors, דומים לשלמים *like to Peace-offerings*, because they were not onely killed in the same place, being all קדשים קלים *Light Holy things*, and had the אימורים or *inward parts* thereof to be burnt likewise upon the Altar; but also in that part of them was to be *eaten by the Owners*. In so much that the Talmudists put many cases, in which a Lamb that was set apart for a *Passeover*, and could not be offered in that Notion, was to be turned into a *Peace-offering*, as that which was neere of kinne to it.

But yet these Masters tell us, there were three precise differences betweene the *Paschah*, and the ordinary *Peace-offering*: בסמיכה ונסכים וחנופת הזה ושוק. First, in that there was no *laying on of hands* upon the *Passeover* in the killing of it, for this was no where commanded as in all the *Peace-offerings*; Secondly,

condly, that there was no *Mincah*, or Meat-offering, nor *Libamen*, or Drink-offering to be joyned with it, (for ſo they uſe to include both in the word *Neſachim*) Thirdly, that there was no *waving of the Breſt & Shoulder* for the Prieſts Portion; the reaſon whereof was, becauſe the Prieſts were bound alwayes to have Paſſeover-offerings of their owne, as it is expreſſed, *Ezra 6.* and ſo needed not any *wave-offering*.

But that the *Paſſeovers* were in other reſpects, of the ſame nature with the *Peace-offerings*, and therefore true and proper Sacrifices; becauſe it is a thing generally not ſo well underſtood, and therefore oppoſed by divers, I ſhall labour the more fully to convince it. I ſay, That the *Paſſeovers* were alwayes brought to the Tabernacle or the Temple, and there preſented and offered up to God by the Prieſt, as all Sacrifices were: That the bloud of them was there ſprinkled upon the Altar, of which the Hebrew Doctors well obſerve, עקר חובת בחויית הדם *the very Eſſence of a Sacrifice, is in the ſprinkling of the bloud:* and alſo that the Imurim (as they call them) that is, the Fat and Kidnies were burnt upon the Altar; All this I ſhall endeavour to demonſtrate.

Onely firſt I muſt premiſe this, that when I ſay the *Paſſeover* was brought to the Tabernacle, and offered by the Prieſts, I doe not meane that the Prieſts were alwayes bound to kill the Paſſeovers: For I grant that the people were wont to kill their owne Paſſeovers, and ſo I find it expreſſely, in the *Miſna* of the *Talmud. Maſſech. Zebach. Cap.* 5. §. 6.

שחט ישראל וקבל הכוהנים: *All Israel killed the Passeover, and the Priests received the bloud:* Which *Talmudicall* Expression alludes to that place, *Exod.* 12. 6. *The whole assembly of the Congregation of Israel shall kill it in the Evening:* Where this seemes to be commanded by God. And the Practice consonant hereunto, I finde intimated at least, in Scripture, in *Hezekiahs* Passeover, 2 *Chron.* 30. 17. *There were many in the Congregation that were not sanctified, therefore the Levites had the charge of killing the Passeover for every one that was not cleane to sanctifie it unto the Lord:* Where *R. Solomon* writeth thus: אל תתמה למה לא שחטו בעלים עצמם: *Wonder not why the Owners themselves did not kill them, for it followeth that many in the Congregation had not sanctified themselves, therefore the Levites were appointed in their place to sanctifie the Worke unto the Lord.* And *R. D. Kimchy* to the same purpose: *Though many of them did eate the Passeover in uncleanesse, it being a case of necessity, in that they had no time to purifie themselves, yet for them to come into the Court and kill the Passeovers, this was not needfull, when it might be done as well by the Levites.* And therefore the same is to be thought likewise of the Priests and Levites killing the Passeover, *Ezr.* 6. because the people returning newly from Captivity, were not yet purified, as it is there also partly intimated.

But this doth not at all hinder our proceeding, or evince the *Passeover* not to be a *Sacrifice*; For it is a great Mistake in most of our learned Writers, to thinke that the killing of every Sacrifice was proper to the Priest, whereas indeed there was no such matter

matter, but as we have already granted that the people commonly killed their owne Passeovers, so we will affirme, that they did the same concerning any of the other Sacrifices. *Levit.* 1.4, 5. It is said concerning the *Burnt-offering: If any man bring a Burnt-offering to the Lord, he shall lay his hand upon the head of the Burnt-offering, AND HE SHALL KILL the Bullock before the Lord, and the Priests Aarons sonnes shall take the bloud:* So concerning the *Peace-offerings*, Chap. 3. *HE shall lay his hand on the head of his offering, and KILL it at the doore of the Tabernacle of the Congregation:* And concerning the *Sinne-offering*, Chap. 4. 24. *HE shall lay his hand on the head of the beast, and KILL it at the place, where they kill the Burnt-offering before the Lord.* We see then what incompetent Judges our owne Authors are, in Jewish Customes and Antiquities. The Jewish Doctors and Antiquaries, (which are so much contemned by some of our Magisteriall Dictators in all Learning) would have taught us here another Lesson. For thus *Maimonides*, in *Biath Hammik.* speaks to this point, שחיטת קודשים בזרות אפילו קודשי קודשים בין קודשי יחיד בין קודשי ציבור שנאמר ושחט את בן הבקר, that is, *The killing of the Holy things may lawfully be done by strangers, yea of the most holy things, whether they be the Holy things of a private person, or of the whole Congregation:* as it is said, (*Levit.* 1.) *And He shall kill the Bullock, & the Priests Aarons sons shal take the bloud.* The same is avouched againe afterward by the same Author in *Maaseh Korban.* Chap. 5. But if any one would therefore faine know what were properly the

Priests actions about the Sacrifice, which might not be done lawfully by any stranger; the same Jewish Authours have a Trite Rule amongst them concerning it: מקבלה ואילך מצוה כחוכה, *The Receiving of the blood and the other parts that were to be offered up, and all that followeth after that, belongeth to the Priests office.* And *Isaak Abrabanel* will teach us more particularly, in his Comment on *Leviticus*, that there were five things to be done by the Owners of the Sacrifice that brought it, and Five things by the Priest that offered it; the first Five, were Laying on of hands, Killing, Flaying, Cutting up, and Washing of the inwards; the other Five were, the Receiving of the blood in a Vessell, the Sprinkling of it upon the Altar, the Putting * of fire upon the Altar, the Ordering of the wood upon the fire, and the Ordering of the pieces upon the wood. Hence it is, that upon the forequoted place of the *Misna*, which I brought to shew, that the People did kill the Passeovers, *Rabbi Obadiah of Bartenora* thus glosseth, שחט ישראל אם ירצה שחשחיטה כשרה בזרים בכל הקרבנות *i. e. The people of Israel might all kill the Passeovers themselves; if they pleased, because the KILLING OF ANY SACRIFICE might be done lawfully by strangers, but the Priests Received the blood.*

* Of this *vide Magistrorum Placita.*

Now I come to prove what I have undertaken. And first, That the Passeover was alwayes brought to the Tabernacle or the Temple, and there offered unto God as the other Sacrifices were, is cleare enough, from *Deut.* 16. *Thou shalt not Sacrifice the Passeover within any of the gates which the Lord thy God*

God giveth thee, but at the place which the Lord thy God chuſeth to place his Name there, there thou ſhalt ſacrifice: And that this is to be underſtood, not of *Jeruſalem* in generall, but of the Tabernacle or Temple, appeares, both becauſe the ſame expreſſions are uſed of the other Sacrifices, *Deut.* 12. ver. 5, 6. 11. 14, Where it is clearely meant that they were to be brought to the Temple: And becauſe it is certaine that every thing that was killed amongſt the Jewes, was either to be killed at the doore of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, or elſe might be killed indifferently in any part of the whole Land. Let us now ſee how the Jewiſh Doctors Comment upon this place, men better skilled in theſe Rites then our owne Authours are. *R. Moſes* B E N *M A I M O N*, in *Halachah Peſach, Cap.* 1. אין שוחטין את הפסח *&c. They kill not the Paſſeover but in the Court, as the reſt of the Holy things, yea in the time when High-places were permitted, they ſacrificed not the Paſſeover in a private High-place, for it is ſaid (Deut.* 16.) *Thou mayſt not ſacrifice the Paſſeover in any of thy gates: We have learnt, that this is a Prohibition to kill the Paſſeover in any private High-place, although it be in a time when High-places are permitted.* From which excellent gloſſe of theirs, it appeareth that there was more preciſeneſſe to be obſerved in bringing of the Paſſeover to the place where Gods name was put, and offering of it at the Tabernacle, or the Temple, then of any of the other Sacrifices. And this was the reaſon as was before intimated out of *K I M C H I*, why in *Hezekiahs* Paſſeover the Levites had the charge of killing: becauſe the Paſſeovers

Passeovers were to be killed in the Court of the Temple, whither the people being uncleane could not enter; for otherwise if it had beene done without the Court, they might as well have killed their owne Passeovers as have eaten them. And this may be further confirmed, in that the Passeover is called a *Korban: Numb. 9. 7. When certaine men were defiled by a dead body, that they could not keepe the Passeover, They came to Moses and said: Wherefore are we kept backe that we may not* OFFER *an* OFFERING *of the Lord in his appointed season:* And againe, ver. 13. *If any one be cleane and forbeareth to keepe the Passeover, even that Soule shall be cut off, because he brought not an* OFFERING *(or a* KORBAN*) to the Lord in his appointed season.* Nothing was called an OFFERING, or a KORBAN, but that which was brought and offered up to God at the Tabernacle or Temple, where his Name was put.

That the Blood of the Passeovers was to be Sprinkled by the Priest, and the Fat to be burnt upon the Altar, although this must needs follow from the former, yet I prove it more particularly, thus, *Exod. 23. 18. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my Sacrifice with leavened Bread, Neither shall the Fat of my Feast remaine untill the morning:* For by the generall consent of the Jewish Scholiasts, and all those Christian interpreters that I have seene, this place is to be understood onely of the Passeover; and therefore ONKELOS that famous Chalday Paraphrast for דם זבחי the *blood of my Sacrifice*, made no question but to read it דם פסחי the *Blood of*

of my Paſſeover. But it appeares undoubtedly, from a Parallell Place in the 34. Chap. of the ſame Booke, ver. 23. 25, 26. Where thoſe 17, 18, and 19. verſes of the 23. Chap. are againe repeated; *Thrice in the yeare ſhall all your men-children appeare before the Lord.* —— *Thou ſhalt not offer the blood of my Sacrifice with leaven, neither ſhall the Sacrifice of the Feaſt of the Paſſeover be left unto the morning. The firſt of the firſt fruites of thy land, thou ſhalt bring into the Houſe of the Lord thy God: Thou ſhalt not ſeeth a Kid in its Mothers Milke.* Here, what was wanting in the former, is ſupplyed. *Neither ſhall the Sacrifice of the Feaſt of the PASSEOVER be left unto the morning.* And I have ſet downe the whole Context with it, becauſe it will be needfull for the better clearing of it, to conſider its coherence with other verſes, which is the very ſame in both Chapters; and *Iſaak Abrabanel* hath ſet it downe excellently in this manner. Firſt therefore, ſaith he, when God had ſpoken of the Jewes appearing thrice before him every yeare, *viz.* at The Feaſt of the *Paſſeover* or of *Unleavened bread*, The Feaſt of *Weekes* or *Pentecoſt*, The Feaſt of *Tabernacles* or *In-gathering*, כיון שהזכיר שלשת החגים החגים נתן בכל אחד מהם משפט מיוחד *i.e.* When he had ſpoken of theſe three Feaſts, he ſubjoynes immediately ſome Rule Concerning every one of them in particular: Firſt, for the *Paſſeover* in thoſe words, *Thou ſhalt not offer the blood of my Sacrifice with leaven, neither ſhall the Sacrifice of the Feaſt of the Paſſeover be left untill the morning:* Secondly, for the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, in thoſe, *The firſt of the firſt fruites of*

the Land thou ſhalt bring into the houſe of the Lord thy God. Thirdly, for the Feaſt of *Tabernacles*, or *Ingathering*, *Thou ſhalt not ſeeth a Kid in his mothers Milke*, which words, for want of this Light of the Context, were never yet ſufficiently explained by any of our Interpreters. And the thread of this Coherence alone, led *Abrabanel* very neare the true meaning of them, ere he was aware: דיותר נראה בזה שהיה ממעשה שבודי עבודת אלילים בזמן קבוציהם לעשות כן ר״ל לבשל הגדיים בחלב בזמן אסיפת התבואות לחשבם שבזה יתרצו לאלוהיהם. *i.e. It ſeemes moſt probable, that this command was occaſioned from a cuſtome amongſt the Idolatrous Heathens, that at the time of their gathering in of fruites, they were wont to boyle a Kid in the Dammes milke, thinking that by this meanes, they were made acceptable to their gods, and did procure a bleſſing by it.* To confirme which Gloſſe, he tels us of a cuſtome ſomewhat like to this, uſed in his time in ſome parts of *Spaine*. But becauſe *Abrabanel* doth not tel his tale ſo handſomely as he ſhould, I will helpe him out a little from an ancient *Karraite*, whoſe Comment I have ſeene upon the Pentateuch, *MSS.* (For the Monuments of theſe *Karraite* Jewes were never yet Printed, and are very rarely ſeene in theſe *European* Parts) And it is thus: *It was a cuſtome of the ancient Heathens, when they had gathered in all their fruites, to take a Kid and boyle it in the Dammes Milke, and then* דרך כשפים *in a Magicall way, to goe about and beſprinkle with it, all their Trees, and Fields, and Gardens, and Orchards: thinking by this meanes they ſhould make them fructifie, and bring forth fruite againe, more abundantly the following*

lowing yeare. Wherefore God forbad his people the Jewes at the time of their Ingathering to use any such superstitious or Idolatrous Rite. And I produce this the rather, because *Abrabanel*, toward the end of his Comment on this place, mentions a glosse of some *KARRAITISH* Authour upon it, although it be altogether unlike to this which we have here related. חכמי הקראים כתבו בטעם לא תבשל גדי שלא תחשב הפרח עם הקרים, *Scribunt Sapientes KARRÆORUM, Ne coquas hœdum in lacte matris suæ: Hoc est, Ne commisceatur Germen cum Radicibus.* But to returne; As from the coherence of the whole Context thus cleared, it is manifest that this verse in both places, is to be understood onely of the *Passeover*: so it may be further confirmed from the *Talmudists*, who ever expound it in this sense, as appeares by the *Misna* in *Zebachin*, Chapter the 6. השוחט את הפסח על החמץ עובר בלא תעשה, *He that killeth the Passeover with leaven, sinneth against a Negative Command*, (which is more amongst the Jewes, then to sinne against a Positive) *viz.* That in these places already quoted, *Thou shalt not offer the blood of my Sacrifice with leaven:* From whence they Collected, as *Maymonides* tels us, that they were to put away Leaven the foureteenth day, a day before the killing of the Passeover. Nay, this place cannot possibly be understood in any other sense, as of Sacrifices in generall, because Leaven was sometimes commanded with Sacrifices, as *Levit.* 7. 13.

But that the Blood of the Passeovers was *sprinkled*,

led, may be demonstrated further, not onely from that of *Hezekiahs* Passeover, 2. *Chron.* 30. 16. *The Priests sprinkled the blood, which they received from the hand of the Levites: For there were many in the Congregation that were not sanctified, therefore the Levites had the charge of killing the Passeovers:* but also from *Iosiahs*, chap. 35. ver. 11. which can no waies be evaded: They, that is, *The Levites, killed the Passeover, and the Priests Sprinkled the Blood from their Hands, and the* Levites *Flayed them.* Now the Sprinkling of the Blood is the Essence of a Sacrifice, as before we noted from the Jewish Doctors. And therefore the *Passeover* must needes be a *Sacrifice*, ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων.

For a Confirmation of all this, I will describe punctually the whole manner of the PASCHAL SACRIFICE, from the *Misna* of the Jewish *Talmud*, a Monument of such antiquity as cannot be distrusted in these Rites. Nothing (say they) was killed before the morning Sacrifice, and after the Evening Sacrifice, nothing but the Passeover: The Evening Sacrifice was usually killed betweene the eighth and ninth houre; that is, halfe an houre after two in the afternoone, and offered betweene the ninth and tenth, that is, halfe an houre after three: But in the Evening of the Passeover, the daily Sacrifice was killed an houre sooner, and after that, began the killing of the Passeover, which was to be done betweene the two Evenings, whereof the first began at Noone from the Sunnes declination toward the West, the Second at Sunne-set: yet the Pascha might be killed before the Daily Sacrifice,

crifice, if there were but one to ſtirre the blood, and keepe it from coagulating, till the blood of the Daily Sacrifice were Sprinkled, for that was alwayes to be ſprinkled firſt: The Paſſeovers were alwayes killed by three ſeverall Companies: When the Court was once full, they ſhut the doores, and the Prieſts ſtood all in their rankes with round veſſels in their hands to receive the blood, thoſe that were of Gold in a ranke by themſelves, and thoſe that were of ſilver, all without bottomes, leſt they ſhould be ſet ſomewhere on the ground, and the blood congeale in them. And they killed the Paſſeovers, as the Peace-offerings, in any part of the Court, becauſe they were קדשים קלים The *leſſe holy things*, as the קדשי קדשים, The *Holy of Holies*, were alwayes to be killed at the North-ſide of the Altar. The Prieſts then tooke the blood, and gave it from one to another, till it came to him that ſtood next the Altar, and he ſprinkled it all at once toward the Bottome of the Altar: which was a Square of 32. Cubits, ſave that the South-Eaſt Horne had no bottome. After the blood was ſprinkled, the Lambe was flayed, and cut up, the *Imurim*, or inwards taken out and laid upon the Altar, then the Owner tooke up the Lambe with the Skinne of it, and carryed it to his owne home. The Firſt company having ended, then the Second came in, and afterward the Third; and for every Company they beganne anew the HALLEL, and ſang all the while the Paſſeovers were killing; but it was never knowne that they had ſung out the HALLEL quite, or came any further then אחרי

before the Priests had done.

But because, besides these Talmudisticke Jewes, there is another Sect of KARRAITES, mentioned before, (that reject all Talmudicall Traditions which are not grounded upon Scripture) though little knowne amongst us, yet famous in the Orient: I will produce one Testimony of theirs also, from an ancient Manuscript, that so it may appeare we have the full consent of all Jewish Antiquity for this Opinion. The Authours name to me is uncertaine, because the Papers have lost both their beginning and end. But they containe in them, divers large and compleate Discourses upon severall Arguments in the *Karraite* way, as about the Jewish yeare, The Sabbath, The Passeover, &c. Concerning the Passeover, he divides his Discourse into severall Chapters, whereof the Title of one is this: במקום הקרבת הפסח ואכילתו, Concerning the Place where the Passeouer was to be Offered and Eaten: Where he thus beginnes. דע שהקרבת הפסח תוא במקום המובחר ככתוב לא תוכל לזבח את הפסח באחד שעריך ומקום שחיטתו בעזרה ושפיכת דמו אל יסוד המזבח ואימוריו ויו נקטרים במזבח *i. e. Know, that the Offering of the Passeover was alwayes in the place which God had chosen,* (to put his Name there) *as it is Written, Thou shalt not sacrifice the Passeover within any of thy gates, and the place of the killing of the Passeover was in the Court called* HESRA, *and the blood of it was powred out toward the bottome of the Altar, and the Imurim, or inward parts of it were burnt upon the Altar, &c.*

Hence

Hence it was that when *Cestius* once demanded what the number of the Jewes was that resorted to *Jerusalem* at the time of their solemne Feasts, The Priests made answer, and told him exactly, how many Lambs and Kids were sacrificed at the Passeover, ὑπὲρ εἴκοσι μυριάδες καὶ πεντακισχίλια ἑξακόσια, *twenty five Myriads, five thousand and sixe hundred*; Which they could not have done, had not they sacrific'd them at the Temple.

But what need have we of any more dispute? when the Passeover was first kept in *Ægypt*, were not the Paschall-Lambs there killed in a Sacrificiall and Expiatory way, When the bloud thereof was to be sprinkled upon the houses, for God to looke upon, and so passe over them? It is true, they were killed in every private house, but the reason of that was, because there were then Priests in every Family, *viz.* The * First-borne, which were afterward redeemed when the children of *Israel* gave up the whole Tribe of *Levi* to God for his service. Such Priests as these were those whom *Moses* sent to sacrifice, *Exod.* 24. 4. called there *young men*. *Moses sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered Burnt-offerings and sacrificed Peace-offerings to the Lord*; Where *Onkelos* the *Chaldee* Paraphrast reads it שלח את בכורוא *He, sent the First-borne*: to which agreeth the Arabick Translation of *R. Saadiah*, and the Persian of *Tawasius* as Master *Selden* notes, whom I cannot without honour mention, as the Glory of our Nation for Orientall Learning.

* *Vide clarif.* Seldenum. *De Succes. in Pontificat. Hebræo. c.* 2. *& de Succes. ad Leges Heb.* 1. *c.* 5.

And was not the killing of the Passeover a speciall Type of the death of Christ, the true Sacrifice of

of the world? Give me leave to note one thing to this purpoſe, upon the credit of *Juſtin Martyr*, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*: That in the ancient Hebrew Copies of the Bible, there was in the Booke of *Ezra* a ſpeech of his which hee made before the Paſſeover, Expounding the Myſtery thereof concerning Chriſt, which becauſe it favoured the Chriſtians, was timely expunged by the Jewes. The ſpeech was this; Καὶ εἶπεν Εσδρὰς τῷ λαῷ. Τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ τὸ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐὰν διανοηθῆτε, καὶ ἀναβῇ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν, ὅτι μέλλομεν αὐτὸν ταπεινοῦν ἐν σημείῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλπιοῦμεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐ ἐρημωθῇ ὁ τόπος οὗτος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸν πάντα χρόνον, λέγει ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ πεισθῆτε αὐτῷ, μηδὲ εἰσακούσητε τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτοῦ, ἔσεσθε ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ἔθνεσι, *i. e. Et dixit Eſdras populo, Hoc Paſcha Salvator noſter & Perfugium noſtrum. Et ſi in animum induxeritis & in Cor veſtrum aſcenderit, quòd humiliaturi eum ſimus in ſigno, & poſteà ſperaturi in eum, non deſolabitur locus iſte in omne tempus, Dicit Deus exercituum. Sin in eum non credideritis, neque audieritis annunciationem ejus, deridiculum eritis gentibus.* Remarkable it is, if it be true; and the Author deſerves the better credit in it, becauſe he was Samaritane, and therefore might be the better skilled in Jewiſh Writings. But however, I am ſure the Apoſtle tels us, not onely that the Paſſeover was a Type of Chriſt in reſpect of his death, but alſo that the Proper Notion of the Paſchall-Feaſt, was, to be a *Feaſt upon Sacrifice*, in thoſe words, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. *Chriſt our Paſſeover is Sacrificed for us, Therefore let us keepe the Feaſt*: (that is, The *Paſchall-Feaſt* upon this *ſacrificed Chriſt*) with the Unleavened Bread of ſincerity and truth.

Where

Where alluding to that common Jewiſh Cuſtome of Feaſting upon Sacrifices, of which we have before ſpoken, he implies that the *Paſchall Supper* was a Feaſt of the ſame nature, *A Sacrificiall Feaſt.*

CHAP. III.

BUT yet we will not diſſemble, what there is of any moment either in Antiquity or Reaſon, againſt our owne opinion, ere we let this diſcourſe paſſe: But ſubject all to an impartiall view.

And firſt, the Authority of *Philo*, who in his third Booke, *De Vitâ Moſis*, ſpeakes thus concerning the Paſſeover: ἐν ᾗ ἔχ ὁι μὲν ἰδιῶται προσάγουσι τῷ βώμῳ τὰ ἱερεῖα, θύουσι δ' ὁι ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ νόμε προσάξει σύμπαν τὸ ἔθνος ἱερέυται, τῶν κτ' μέρος ἑκάστε τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν θυσίας, ἀνάροντες αὖτε κ) χαιρεγένυσι. Ο μὲν ἓν ἀλλὸς ἅπας λεὼς ἐγεγήθει κ) φαίδρος ἦν, ἑκάστε νομίζοντος ἱερωσύνη τετιμῆδαι. *i. e. In quâ non ut aliâs plebeii homines victimas adducunt ad altare mactandas à ſacerdotibus, ſed jubente lege, tota gens ſacrificat, dum pro ſe quiſque mactat hoſtiam ſuis manibus. Tunc univerſus populus exultabat, unoquoque exiſtimante, ſe Sacerdotii dignitate honoratum.* And againe in his Booke *De Decalogo*, Ἐν ᾗ θύσι παρόντες αὐτῶν ἕκαστος, τὸς ἱερεῖς αὐτῶν ὐκ ἀναμένοντες, ἱερωσύνην τὰ νομὰ χαρισαμένε ἑκάστῳ ἔθνει παντὸ, μίαν ἡμέραν ἐξαίρετον ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος, ἐς ἀυτεργίαν θυσιῶν. *Quando populariter ſinguli ſacrificant non expectatis ſacerdotibus, ipſi permiſſu legis fungentes Sacerdotio, quotannis per unum diem deſtinatum huic negotio.* But to this we anſwer, That *Philo* doth not here deny the Paſſeover to be a Sacrifice, but con-

firme it rather, in that he cals it often here and elsewhere θυσίαν, and saith that they did ἀνάγειν, *bring it to the Altar*; and that the people did ἱερᾶσθαι, *Sacrifice it*; and doth only distinguish this *Paschall-Sacrifice* from all the other Sacrifices, in this, that here according to his opinion, every one of the people was ἱερωσύνῃ τετιμμένος, *honoured with the Priestly-office*, and that the Law did ἱερωσύνην παντὶ τῷ ἔθνει χαρίζεσθαι, *make every one a Priest for that time to offer up their owne Passeover*: But moreover, it is well knowne, that *Philo* though he were a Jew by Nation, yet was very * ignorant of Jewish customes, having beene borne and bred up at *Alexandria*: and we have a *Specimen* of his mistakes here, in that he seemes to make this difference betweene the Passeover and the other Sacrifices, that they were onely killed by the Priest, but the people themselves killed their owne Passeovers νόμῳ σφαγῆς, & νόμῳ κρεουργίας, according to the Law; where he meanes doubtlesse, that in *Exod* 12. 6. *The whole Assembly of the Congregation of Israel shall kill it*. For this is that *Solenne delirium* of our late Authors also, which we have chastized before. But if he meane moreover, that the people did not onely kill their Passeovers, but doe all other Priestly offices concerning them; when hee saies they were ἱερωσύνῃ τετιμμένοι, this, as it hath no ground from Scripture, and I thinke will hardly find a Patron now to defend it, so it doth not prejudice our opinion of the *Passeovers being a Sacrifice*, but still much confirme it.

* *Scalig. Elench. Tribær. cap. 25. circa finem. Item in Emend. Temp. De Cyclo Iudæorum Karraim. & Hug. Grotius in Mat. 26.*

Secondly, it may seeme to some, a kind of impossibility

possibility to conceive, How so many Sacrifices as there must be at every Passeover, could all be offered upon one Altar, since there was no more by the Law permitted. To which nevertheless I need not answer any thing but this, that there was nothing but the Fat, and some of the Inwards, burnt upon the Altar, and that the Bigness of the Altar was greater then perhaps is ordinarily conceived; for under the second Temple, the *Area* thereof upon the Top, was a *Square of twenty eight Cubits*, as the Talmudists constantly relate, to which *Josephus* also agreeth very neere, if the difference of those Cubits which he useth be allowed. Onely, they may please to learne from the Instance of *Josias* Passeover, which was said to be so great, that *there was no Passeover like to that kept in Israel from the daies of* Samuel *the Prophet unto that time*; that this was possible to be done: For it either is, or must be confessed, that then they were all offered upon the Altar.

But lastly, we must confesse ingenuously, that there is one Great Difficulty yet behind, concerning our Saviours last Passeover, which according to the Generall Consent of our best Divines, Criticks, and Chronologers, was kept a Day before the Jewes kept their Passeover: Whether therefore his Paschall-Lamb which he with his Apostles did then Eate, were first Sacrificed at the Temple, and How that could be?

Where not to engage our selves any more then needs we must, in that nice & perplexed, but Famous Controversie, concerning *the time of the Jewish*

Passeover about our Saviours death. It will not be amisse, first to take notice, that the *Latin Church* ever maintained the contrary opinion against the *Greeks*, *viz.* that the Jewes kept the Passeover on the same night which our Saviour did: and though it be true that of later times, most of our Best-Learned Authors have quitted that opinion of the Latins, and closed altogether with the Greeks, as *Paulus Burgensis*, *Munster*, *Scaliger*, and *Casaubon*, yet notwithstanding, our Country-man Master *Broughton*, understanding perhaps better then they did, that the Jewish Passeover was a true and proper Sacrifice, & first, according to Gods command, was to be offered up to God, before Feasted on; he espied a difficulty here concerning our Saviours Passeover, (which they tooke no notice of) that could not easily be solved, and therefore he thought good *Scindere nodum*, as *Alexander* did, *to cut the knot, which he could not loose*, and absolutely to deny that the Jewish Passeover and our Saviours were then celebrated on two severall Nights. And he is of late seconded by *Johannes Cloppenburg* a Belgick Divine, [in a learned Epistle written upon this Argument to *Ludovicus De Dieu*] insisting upon the very same ground, because the Paschall-Lamb, which Christ with his Disciples did eate, could not have beene sacrificed at the Temple, unlesse it had beene, at the same time when the Jewish Passeover was solemnly celebrated. His words to this purpose expressing fully Master *Broughtons* sense, are these. *Non potuit mactari Agnus Paschalis extra Templum Hierosolymitanum. In templo mactari non potuit citra generalem*

lem populi consensum; Quare neque Dies mactationis potuit anticipari: It followes, *Vel ergo dicendum Christum comedisse agnum mactatum in Templo, atque hoc facto (quod absit) Legem violasse; juxta legem enim agnus privatim Comedendas, è Templo deferendus domi erat in ædes privatus, post igne absumptum in Templo adipem, & sanguinem delatum ad altare.*

But I must confesse, although I am as much addicted to that *Hypothesis*, of *the Passeowers being a Sacrifice*, and as tender of it, as Master *Broughton* could be, or any body else; yet I cannot but yeeld my selfe captive to Truth, on which side soever it present it selfe, and though it be εἰς τὰ φαινόμενα ἀντιλέγειν (as *Aristotle* saith a Philosopher should do) to *the destruction of our own Phænomena*. And indeed those two Places especially, brought out of Saint *Johns* Gospel, to prove that the Jewes kept their Passeover, the day after our Saviour did his, seeme to me to be unanswerable, nor any way cured by those σοφὰ φάρμακα, which are applied to them. The first is *Chap.* 19. *ver.* 14. where, the next day after Christ had kept his Passeover with his Disciples, when *Pilate* delivered him up to the Jewes to be crucified, it is said, that it was then, Παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, *The Preparation of the Passeover*, where they tell us, that by *The Preparation of the Passeover*, is meant, *The Preparation of the Sabbath on which the Second day of the Feast of the Passeover fell.* But *En Jecur Criticum!* as *Scaliger* sometimes cries out: and what a farre-fetcht conceit is this? The second is that in Chap. 18. vers. 28. when Jesus was led into *Pilates* Judgement-Hall, early in the morning, it is said,

that *the Jewes themſelves went not into the Judgement-Hall, leſt they ſhould be defiled, but that they might eate the Paſſeover.* Here we are told, that by Eating of the Paſſeover, is meant the eating of the *Chagigah*, that was killed the day before with the Paſſeover, whereof ſomething perhaps remained till the day following. And this gloſſe is little better then the former: for although they appeale to that place in *Deut.* 16.2. to prove that the *Chagigah* was ſometimes called by the name of *Paſſeover*; which indeed if our Engliſh Tranſlation were authenticke, would make ſomething for them; *Thou ſhalt therefore Sacrifice the Paſſeover unto the Lord thy God, of the ſhocke, and the Heard*, as if there had beene a *Paſſeover* of Oxen, as well as Sheepe. Yet in the Hebrew the words runne thus, וזבחת פסח ליהוה אלהיך צאן ובקר, which according to a ſeverall Punctation, and a ſeverall ſupplying of ſomething that muſt be underſtood, may be expounded ſeverall wayes; any of which is farre better, then that which our Engliſh Tranſlators unhappily pitcht upon. *Onkelos* in his Paraphraſe (which ſeldome merits that name, being indeed commonly nothing but a Rigid Verſion) reads it thus: ותכוס פסחא קדם יהוה אלהיך מן בני ענא ונכסת קדשיא: מן חורי *i.e.* *And thou ſhalt ſacrifice the Paſſeover before the Lord thy God, of the ſonnes of the Flock, and the Peace-offerings (thereof) of Oxen:* which interpretation is followed by *R. Solomon*, and *Aben-Ezra*, צאן לחובת הפסח ובקר לשלמים, *i.e.* Sheepe for the *Paſſeover*, and Oxen for the *Peace-offerings*, or the *Chagigah*. And it may be confirmed from that of *Hezekiahs* Paſſeover, 2 *Chron.* 35.v.7.

35. v. 7. *Josiah gave to the people, of the Flocke, Lambs, and Kids, all for the Passeover-offerings to the number of thirty thousand, and three thousand Bullocks:* where the Bullocks or the Heard, are divided from the *Passeover-offerings*, because they served for the Peace-offerings, or the *Chagigah*, as appeareth from *v.*13. They roasted the Passeovers with fire according to the ordinance, but the OTHER HOLY OFFERINGS (that is, the Peace-offerings or *Chagigah*) sod they in Pots, and Cauldrons, and Pans. *Nachmanides* hath another interpretation of it, to this purpose, ויצוה בפסח והוא חשח שחזכיר כבר וצאן ובקר אליהם ועזים ובני בקר לחוג ותגיגה i.e. *He commandeth here the Passeover, which was a Lambe as he had said before*, (making the Pause there) *and* צאן ובקר. *The Flock and the Heard, or the Sheepe and the Kids, and the young Bullocks, for the Chagigah.* Giving other instances in which the Conjunctive Particle *Vau*, which he doth here supply, is in like manner to be understood. And this Exposition is rather approved then the former, not onely by *Abrabanel*, but also by the *Karraite*, which I have so often commended, who quoting one *R. Aaron* for the Author of it, doth expresse it thus, ויזה מאמר וזבחת מושך עצמו ואחר עמו וזבחת פסח ליהוה אלהיך וזבחת צאן ובקר כמו ולא למדתי חכמה ודעת קדושים אות i.e. *The word* וזבחת (*thou shalt Sacrifice*) *is to be repeated,* את צאנך, *before*, THE FLOCK AND THE HEARD, *thus, And thou shalt Sacrifice the Passeover to the Lord thy God, and thou shalt Sacrifice Sheepe and Oxen, or the Flock and the Heard; as in like manner, Prov.* 30. 3. *the Particle* לא, *non, is to be repeated*

את

σωνῆς; *From the former verse.* So that it cannot hence be proved that the Peace-offerings offered with the Passeover, were ever called by the name of Passeover.

There is another place in the same Evangelist, that hath not beene observed by any one to this purpose, which if it were rightly understood, would be as cleare a Testimony as any of the rest. And it is in the 19. Chapter, v. 31. ἦν δὲ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ Σαββάτου, *For that Sabbath day was a great Day.* Μεγάλη ἡμέρα, in the Greeke of the *Hellenists*, is used for the first or the last day of every solemne Feast, in which there was a Holy Convocation to the Lord. This appeareth from *Esay* 1.13. *Your Newmoones, and Sabbaths, the Calling of Assemblies* (which was the first and last day of the Feast) *I cannot away with.* Which the Septuagint renders thus, Τὰς Νουμηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ Σάββατα, καὶ τὰς μεγάλας ἡμέρας, *Your Newmoones and Sabbaths, and your* GREAT DAYES. For the last day of the Feast, we have it used by our Evangelist, Chap. 7. ver. 37. *In the last Day, the* GREAT DAY *of the Feast,* ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆ ἑορτῆς. And doubtlesse by the same Evangelist, for the First day of the Feast, in this place: and therefore the Jewes did not Eate their Passeover, till the night before, which was the same night that our Saviour was crucifyed.

Which may be strengthened further by this Argument. That if the Jewes had celebrated their Passeover the same night which our Saviour did his, it is certaine they would never have gone about immediately, with swords and staves to have apprehen-

prehended him, and then have brought him to the High-Priests Hall, and afterward have arraigned him, at *Pilates* Judgement seate, and lastly have crucified him, all the same day. For the First day of unleavened Bread, was by the Law an Holy Convocation to the Lord, on which it was not lawfull to doe any worke: And we know the Jewes were rigid enough in observing these Legall Ceremonies.

If then it must be granted that our Saviour with his Disciples kept the Passeover the night before the vulgar Jewes did celebrate it, Our next Worke is, to shew how it might be probable, that our Saviours Passeover was first Sacrificed at the Temple.

And here perhaps I might runne for shelter to that story in *Suidas* upon the Word Ἰησοῦς, that Christ was enrolled into the number of the two and twenty Legall Priests that served at the Altar, from the pretended Confession of an ancient Jew in *Justinians* time; and then he might possibly Sacrifice his owne Passeover at the Temple, though the Jewes had not solemnized theirs till the day after. But that I hold this to be a meere Fable, and that not onely ridiculous, but impious.

Or, I might take up the opinion of the Greekes, that Christ did not keepe a true Legall Passeover, but a Feast of Unleavened Bread in Imitation of it. Or as the learned *Hugo* * *Grotius*, who hath lately asserted this opinion, expresseth it, not πάσχα θύειν, but μαζωτοφαγεῖν, such as the Jewes at this day keepe,

* *In Annot. ad Matth. cap. 26.*

becauſe the Temple being downe, their Sacrifices are all ceaſed. But this opinion hath beene exploded by moſt of our late Authours, and indeed I can no way ſatisfie my ſelfe in it, and therefore will not *acquieſce* in this anſwer.

But before we be able to give a true account of this *Quære*, We muſt ſearch a little deeper into the true ground of this difference betweene our Saviours Paſſeover and the Jewes.

The common opinion is, that the Jewes in our Saviours time were wont to tranſlate their Feſtivals from one *Feria* to another upon ſeverall occaſions, as when ever two Feſtivals were immediately to follow one another, to joyne them into one, and therefore when any fell upon the ſixth *Feria*, to put it over to the next *Feria*, or the Sabbath, to avoyd the concurrence of two Sabbaths together: in the ſame manner as the Jewes uſe to do in their Calendar at this day, where they have ſeverall Rules to this purpoſe, expreſſed by Abbreviatures thus, *Adu Badu, Gahaz, Zabad, Agu*. Whereof each Letter is a Numerall for ſome *Feria*; The Rule for the Paſſeover is בד *Badu*: that is, that it ſhould not be kept on the Second, Fourth, or Sixth *Feria*. (There is an Extract of a Rabbinicall Decree to this purpoſe under the name of *R. Elieẓer*: in *Munſter* upon *Matth. cap.* 26.) And therefore at this time when our Saviour was crucified, the Paſſeover falling upon the ſixth *Feria*, or Friday; was (ſay they) by the Jews tranſlated, according to this Rule, to the next *Feria*, and kept on Saturday, or the Sabbath; but our Saviour not regarding theſe Traditions, obſerved that

day

day preciſely which was commanded in the Law, ὅτε ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα *Luk.* 22.7. that is, as they expound it, *Upon which the Paſſeover* OUGHT *to have beene killed, which was Friday, the day before.*

But, under favour, I conceive that all theſe Decrees, together with that *Ratiocinium* or Calendar, to which they doe belong, were not then in uſe in our Saviours time, although it be ſo confidently averred by the incomparable *Joſeph Scaliger*, but long ſince invented by the Jewes. Which I ſhall make appeare, Firſt, in that the ancient Jewes, about, and ſince our Saviours time, often ſolemnized as well the Paſſeovers, as the other Feaſts upon the *Feria's* next before, and after the Sabbaths, and thoſe other *Feria's*, which have beene made Rejectitious ſince, by that Calendar: In the Talmudicall Title *Succoth*, Chap. the laſt, we read of יום טוב הסמוך לשבת בין לפניה בין לאחריה: that is, *A Feaſt going immediately before, or following immediately after the Sabbath.* And in *Betzah*, cvi. יום טוב שהול להיות ערב שבת וחל להיות אחר שבת, And, *A Feaſt that fals to be on the evening of the Sabbath, or the day after the Sabbath.* In *Chagigah*, the ſecond Chapter, עצרת שהול להיות בערב שבת, which is to the ſame purpoſe with the former. More particularly concerning the Paſſeover. *Peſachim* chap. 7. Sect. 10. *Oſſa, nervi, & omne reſiduum Agni Paſchalis cremantor ſexto decimo.* Si is dies SABBATUM, *decimo ſeptimo.* From this and divers the like places of the Talmud, *Aben Ezra*, on *Levit.* 23. ver. 4. obſerves, במשנה גם בתלמוד ראיות שהיה פסח בבוקר, *There be divers inſtances in the*

Miſna, and the Gemara, of the Paſſeovers being kept in BADU. That is, on thoſe dayes which were made Rejectitious in the late Calendar, the Second, Fourth, and Sixth *Feria*. Therefore theſe Tranſlations were not in uſe, when the Doctors of the *Miſna* and *Gemara* lived. Secondly, In that the Jewes ever while the Temple ſtood, obſerved their New-Moones and Feaſts according to the φάσις or *Apparence* of the Moone, and therefore had no Calendar for their Rule to ſanctify their Feaſts by, but they were then ſanctifyed by the Heavens, as the *Miſna* ſpeakes. This is ſo clearely delivered by *R. Moſes Ben Majemon* in that excellent *Halachah* entituled KIDDUSH HACCHODESH, that I wonder ſo many learned men, that are well skilled in theſe Authours, ſhould miſſe of it. For having ſpoken of the Rules of obſerving the φάσις, he then addes, that theſe were never made uſe of ſince the *Sanhedrin* ceaſed in the Land of *Iſrael*, after the deſtruction of the Temple, ſince which time they have uſed a Calendar, calculated according to the middle Motion of the Moone, הדבר זה הלכה למשה מסיני הוא שבזמן שיש בהם סנהדרין קובעין עלפי הראיה ובזמן שאין שם סנהדרין קובעין עלפי החשבון חזרו שאנו מחשבים בו היום ואין נזקקין לראיה אלא שמא שהיה יום שקובעין בחשבון זה הוא יום הראייה או קודם לו ביום או אחריו ביום. *Et hoc erat Traditio Moſis in Monte Sinai, quòd omni tempore quo duraret Sanhedrin, conſtituerent Neomenias juxta* φάσιν. *Hoc verò tempore quo jam ceſſavit Sanhedrin, conſtituerent ſecundum Calculum hunc Aſtronomicum quo nos hodie utimur; nec ullo modo jam*

ad

ad φάσιν nos astringimus, cùm sæpe contingat ut dies Legitimus secundum nostrum calculum, vel concurrat cum Lunari φάσει, vel antevortat eam unica die, vel etiam subsequatur. And againe a little after most punctually, ומאימתי התחילו כל ישראל לחשוב בחשבון זה מסוף חכמי תלמוד בעת שחרבה ארץ ישראל ולא נשאר בית-דין קבוע אבל בימי חכמי משנה וכן בימי חכמי תלמוד עד ימי אביי ורבא על קבעות ארץ ישראל היו סומכין. *Quando primum cœperunt omnes Israelitæ computare secundum hunc calculum? A Fine doctorum Talmudicorum, quando jam desolata erat Terra Israel, neque erat Consistorium aut Synedrium quod determinaret, Nam per omnes dies Doctorum Misnæ & Doctorum Gemaræ, usque ad Abaum & Rabbaum, acquiescebant omnes Judæi in Sanctione Terræ Israelis.* And those Rules forementioned of not keeping the severall Feasts upon such and such *Feria's*, were made together with this Calendar, as the same Authour there also avoucheth, אין קובעין בחשבון זה בימי אד"ו לפי שהחשבון זה הוא לקבץ הירח ושמש בהליכה אמצעי' לא במקום אמתי לפיכך עשו יום קביעה ויום דחייה *i.e. In this account, they never constituted the New Moon of Tisri upon Adu, because this Accompt was made according to the Conjunction of the Sunne and Moone, in the middle Motion, therefore now they constituted some Legitimate and other Rejectitious dayes, which they could not doe before, when the New Moone (and therefore all the other Feasts) were determined according to the φάσις.*

But the Talmud was not compleatly finished, till about the 500. yeare of the Christian *Æra*, there-

fore this Jewiſh Calendar, and theſe Rules concerning the Tranſlation of Feaſts were not in being, till about that time: and ſo could be no reaſon of this difference betweene the time in which our Saviour ſolemnized the Paſſeover, and the other Jewes.

For further confirmation hereof, we may obſerve that the *Karraites*, which have rejected the fond Traditions of the Phariſees, retaine ſtill the ancient cuſtome of reckoning their New-Moons, ἀπὸ τῆς φάσεως, as * *Scaliger* himſelfe hath well obſerved: though in this he were miſtaken, that he thought they had aſſumed it of late, meerely out of hatred to the other Jewes, whereas they have kept it in a conſtant ſucceſſion from antiquity, and hold it ſtill, as neceſſary by Divine Right. אמנם זאת מהתעתקה שכל ישראל מודים בה שמזמן המלכות היו מקדשים החדשים בראיית הירח: ועוד מחקש כח מהבור יודע הענין ממלת חדש יורה שחוא חדוש החבר והוא חדוש ירח בכל חדש. *This is confeſſed by all Iſrael, that from the time of the Kingdome, they were ever wont to conſecrate the New-moones by the φάσις: and the very Etymon of the word* Chodeſh *implies ſo much, for it ſignifies The Renewing of ſomething, ſo that it is denominated from the Change of the Moone, or Phaſis, as the Epocha and beginning of it.* And this is one of the Great Controverſies to this day, betweene thoſe two Sects of the Jewes the קראים or *Karrai*, and רבנים or *Rabbanai*: which is growne at length to ſuch a height, that the *Karraites*, decyphering the conditions of thoſe witneſſes, whoſe Teſtimonies might be accounted valid for the φάσις, make this for one, that they ſhould no way belong

Emend. Temp. p. 149. 150.

to

to the Sect of *Rabbanists*: which perhaps to observe in the Authors owne words, would not be unpleasing πῶς φιλαρχάιους καὶ φιλολόγους. חתנאי השני שלא יהיה חלוק ברעתו בקדוש החדש מדעת חכמינו והנה מזה הצד ראוי לקבל עדות הישמעלים מפני שהם הולכים אחרי דעת חכמינו בעניני הראיה וברוב הזמנים אנו שוים עמהם ואין ראוי לקבל לנו עדות חרבנים מפני שהם חלוקים ממנגו בזה ואעפ שאחינו ובשרנו הם אמנם בזה מרו ועצבו את רוח קדשו. i. e. *A second condition is, that they be not such as hold an opinion concerning the Sanctification of the New-Moone different from the opinion of Our Wisemen. And therefore in this regard, we may receive the Testimony of the Ishmaelites (that is, the Turks and Saracens) because they follow the opinion of Our Wisemen Concerning the Phasis, and in most of their appointed times they agree with us: But we may not receive the testimony of any one that is of the Sect of the Rabbins, because they are divided from us in this; And although they be our brethren and our flesh, yet herein they have rebelled and grieved his holy Spirit.*

Having thus disproved the common and received opinion, and removed the false Ground of this Difference of time, betweene our Saviours Passeover and the Jewes, we come in the next place to lay downe the True, which must be derived from that way of reckoning the moneths, and of determining the ראש חדש, *the Head or Beginning of the moneth*, which was in use in our Saviours time, which as we have shewed already in generall, was by the φάσις, so it will be expedient to describe the whole manner of it more particularly from authentick Authors*. In

* *Talmud. Babyl. in Rosh. Hashanah. & Maimon. in Kiddush Hachod.*

In the great or outer Court of the Temple, there was a Houſe called *Beth-Jaẓek*, where the Senate ſate all the thirtieth day of every Moneth, to receive the Witneſſes of the Moones apparence, and to examine them. And here they alwayes had a Feaſt provided for the entertainment of thoſe that came, to encourage men to come the more willingly. In ancient times, they did admit of ſtrangers, and receive their Teſtimony, if it were approved upon examination. But when the Hereticks (that is, the Chriſtians) afterward grew up, by whom, they ſay, they were ſometimes deluded, they began to grow ſhy, and to admit of none but ſuch as were approved of, to be of the Jewes Religion. If there came approved Witneſſes upon the thirtieth day, of the νέας ſeene, then the chiefe man of the Senate ſtood up and pronounced MEKUDDASH, *it is ſanctified:* and the people ſtanding by, caught the word from him, and cried out, MEKUDDASH, MEKUDDASH. Whereupon there was notice preſently given to all the Country: which was done at firſt by Torches from Mountaine to Mountain, till at length the Chriſtians (they ſay) abuſed them in that kind alſo with falſe fires: wherefore they were faine to ſend Meſſengers from place to place, over the whole Land to give intelligence of the New-Moone. But if, when the Conſiſtory had ſate all the thirtieth day, there came no approved Witneſſes of the νέας, then they made an intercalation of one day in the former Month, and decreed the following, one and thirtieth day, to be the Calends. And yet notwithſtanding, if after the fourth or fifth day, there ſhould come ſome Witneſſes

Witnesses from afarre, that testified, they had seene the φάσις in its due time, nay, though they came toward the end of the Moneth, (אפילו באו בסוף החדש) The Senate, when they had used all meanes by affrighting them from that Testimony, that so, if it were possible, they might decline a New Consecration; (after they had already made an *Emboliſme* in the former Moneth) if the Witnesses remained constant, were then bound to alter the beginning of the Moneth, and reckon it a day sooner, to wit, from the thirtieth day.

Here we see the True Ground of the Difference of a day, that might arise continually about the Calends of the Moneth, and so consequently about any of the other Feasts which did all depend on them, *viz.* Betweene the true Time of the Moones φάσις, upon the thirtieth day, and that of the Senates Decree a day after. For since it appeares out of their owne Monuments, how unwilling they were, having once made a Consecration of the *Neomenia*, to alter it againe; it may be probably conceived that in those degenerated times, the Senate might many times refuse to accept the Testimony of undoubted Witnesses: And then it seemes they had such a Canon as this: בית דין שקדשו את החודש בין שהנים בין מוטעים הנה זה מקודש וחייבין הכל לחקן המועדים על היום אע"פי שזה יודע שטעו *That whatsoever Time the Senate should conclude of for the Calends of the Moneth, though it were certaine they were in the wrong, yet all were bound to order their Feasts according to it:* Which I cannot thinke was approved of by our Saviour, and the most pious Jewes.

And therefore I conceive it most probable, that this was the very case betweene our Saviours Passeover and the Jewes, in that he followed the True φάσις, confirmed by sufficient and assured Witnesses; but the other Jewes superstitiously observed the Pertinacious Decree of the Senate or Sanhedrin, which was for the day after.

And now at last, we are come againe to the *Acme* of the Question, that was first propounded, How our Saviours Passeover, notwithstanding all this, might be sacrificed the day before those of the other Jewes were.

To which I answer, that upon this Ground, not only our Saviour & his Apostles, but also divers others of the most religious Jewes, kept the Passeover upon the fifteenth day from the true φάσις of the Moone, and not from the Senates Decree; which I may confirm from the Testimony of *Epiphanius*, that reports, there was at this time στάσις, a Tumult, and contention amongst the Jewes about the Passeover; and so we may easily perswade those other Evangelists, that intimate Christs Passeover to have beene solemnized, when many others kept it, to agree with Saint *Iohn*, who assures us, that it was also by divers Jewes kept the day after. Now it was a Custome among the Jewes, in such doubtfull cases as these, which oftentimes fell out, to permit the Feasts to be solemnized, or Passeovers killed, on two severall dayes together. *Maymonides* affirmeth, that in the remoter parts of the Land of *Israel*, they alway solemnized the Feast of the New-Moones two dayes together, nay, in *Jerusalem* it selfe where

In Panario Her. LI.

the

the Senate ſate, they kept the New-Moone of *Tiſri*, which was the beginning of the yeare, twice, leſt they ſhould be miſtaken in it. In the *Talmud* we have an inſtance, of the *Paſſeovers* being kept two daies together, becauſe the New-Moone was doubtfull, in *Gemara Roſh Haſhanah. cap.* 1. Hence the Karraites who ſtill keepe the ancient cuſtome of obſerving the Moones, retaine it as a Rule to this day, מספק לעשות שני ימים *Obſervare duos dies propter dubium.* Nay, the Rabbinicall Jewes themſelves ſince they have changed the *Phaſis*, for the Synod or Conjunction of the Moone in the middle motion, in imitation hereof ſtill obſerve to keepe the Paſſeover two dayes together, *iiſdem ceremoniis*, as the learned Author of the Jewiſh Synagogue reports: and *Scaliger* himſelfe, not onely of that, but alſo of the other Feaſts. *Iudæi poſt inſtitutionem hodierni computi, eandem ſolennitatem celebrant biduò: propterea quòd menſes incipiant à medio motu Lunæ: itaque* מספק מוצרות המאורות *propter dubium Conjunctionis Luminarium, Paſcha celebrant* 15. *&* 16. *Niſan. Pentecoſten* 6. *&* 7. *Sivan. Scenopagiam* 15. *&* 16. *Tiſri. idque vocant* יום טוב שני של גליות *Feſtum Secundum Exiliorum.*

Now then we ſee that nothing hinders but that the Paſſeover might be a Sacrifice. And thus we have hitherto cleared the way.

CHAP. IV.

BUT leſt we ſhould ſeeme all this while, to Set up Fancies of our owne, and then Sport with them; We come now to Demonſtrate and Evince that the *Lords Supper* in the proper *Notion* of it, is EPULUM EX OBLATIS, or, A FEAST UPON SACRIFICE; in the ſame manner with the *Feaſts* upon the Jewiſh *Sacrifices* under the Law; and the *Feaſts* upon ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΑ (*things offered up to Idols*) among the Heathens: And that from a place of Scripture where all theſe three ſhall be compared together, and made exact *Parallels* to one another.

1 CORIN. 10.

14. *Wherefore my dearely beloved, flee from Idolatry.*
15. *I ſpeake as to wiſe men, judge you what I ſay.*
16. *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſſe, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt? The Bread which we breake, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?*
18. *Behold Iſrael after the fleſh, are not they which eate of the Sacrifices partakers of the Altar?*
20. *Now I ſay the things which the Gentiles Sacrifice, they Sacrifice to Devils and not to God; and I would not that you ſhould have Fellowſhip with Devils.*
21. *Ye cannot drinke the Cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lords Table, and the Table of Devils.*

Where

Where the Apostles Scope being to convince the *Corinthians* of the unlawfulnesse of Eating things Sacrificed to Idols; He doth it in this manner: Shewing, that though an Idoll were truely Nothing, and things Sacrificed to Idols were Physically, Nothing, as different from other Meates; [as it seemes they argued, and Saint *Paul* confesses, ver. 19.] Yet Morally and Circumstantially, to Eate of things Sacrificed to Idols, in the Idols Temple, was to consent with the Sacrifices, and to be guilty of them: Which he doth illustrate, First, from a *Parallel Rite*, in Christian Religion. Where the Eating and Drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ, offered up to God upon the Crosse for us, in the *Lords Supper*, is a Reall Communication in his Death and Sacrifice, ver. 16. *The Cup of blessing which we blesse, is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ? &c.*

Secondly, From another *Parallel* of the same Rite among the Jewes. Where, alwayes they that Eate of the Sacrifices, were accounted partakers of the Altar, that is, Of the Sacrifice offered up upon the Altar, ver. 18. *Behold Israel after the flesh, are not they which Eate of the Sacrifices partakers of the Altar? In veteri Lege quicunque admittebantur ad Edendum de Hostiis Oblatis, censebantur ipsius Sacrificii tanquam pro ipsis Oblati, fieri Participes, & per illud Sanctificari:* As a Late Commentator fully expresses it.

Therefore, as to Eate the Body and Blood of Christ in the *Lords Supper*, is to be made partaker of his Sacrifice offered up to God for us; as to Eate

of the Jewish Sacrifices under the Law, was to partake in the Legall Sacrifices themselves: So to Eate of things offered up in Sacrifice to Idols, was to be made partakers of the Idoll-Sacrifices: And therefore was unlawfull.

For, the things which the Gentiles Sacrifice, they Sacrifice to Devils, but Christs Body and Blood was offered up in Sacrifice unto God, and therefore they could not partake of both together; the Sacrifice of the true God, and the Sacrifice of Devils. *Ye cannot drinke the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lords Table, and the table of Devils.* S. *Pauls* Argument here, must needs suppose a perfect *Analogy* between these three, and that they are all *Parallels* to one another, or else it hath no strength. Wherefore I conclude from hence, that the LORDS SUPPER is the same among Christians, in respect of the *Christian Sacrifice*, that among the Jewes the *Feasts* upon the *Legall Sacrifices* were, and among the Gentiles, the *Feasts* upon the *Idoll-Sacrifices*: and therefore EPULUM SACRIFICIALE, *or*, EPULUM EX OBLATIS: ΟΠΕΡ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗΣ.

CHAP. V.

THUS having Declared and Demonstrated *The True Notion of The Lords Supper:* We see then, How that Theologicall Controversie, which hath cost so many Disputes, *Whether the Lords Supper*

Supper be a Sacrifice, is already decided; for it is not SACRIFICIUM, but EPULUM EK THS ΘΥΣΙΑΣ: Not A SACRIFICE, but *A Feaſt upon Sacrifice*: or elſe in other Words, Not OBLATIO SACRIFICII, but as *Tertullian* excellently ſpeakes, PARTICIPATIO SACRIFICII: Not the *Offering of ſomething up to God upon an Altar*, but the *Eating of ſomething which comes from Gods Altar*, and is ſet upon Our Tables. Neither was it ever knowne amongſt the Jewes or Heathens, that thoſe Tables upon which they did eate Their Sacrifices, ſhould be called by the Name of Altars. Saint *Paul* ſpeaking of the Feaſts upon the Idoll-Sacrifices, calls the places upon which they were eaten, *The Tables of Devils*, becauſe the Devils meate was eaten on them, not the Altars of Devils: and yet doubtleſſe he ſpake according to the true Propriety of ſpeech, and in thoſe Technicall Words that were then in uſe amongſt them. And therefore keeping the ſame Analogy, he muſt needes call the *Communion Table*, by the name of the *Lords Table*: *i. e.* The Table upon which *Gods Meate* is eaten, not his Altar, upon which it is offered. It is true, an *Altar* is nothing but a *Table*, but it is *A Table upon which* GOD *himſelfe eates*, conſuming the Sacrifices by his *Holy Fire*: but when the ſame Meate is given from GOD unto US to Eate of, the relation being changed, the place on which WE Eate, is nothing but a *Table*.

And becauſe it is not enough in any Diſcourſe, as *Ariſtotle* well obſerveth in his *Ethicks*, to confute an

an Error, unleſſe we can alſo ſhew τὸ ἀιτιον τῆ ψευδους; *The Cauſe of that Error*; Having thus Diſcovered *The True Notion of the Lords Supper*, we may eaſily from hence diſcerne alſo, How that miſtake grew up, and that by the Degeneration of this Truth. There is a Sacrifice in the Lords Supper Symbolically, but not there as Offered up to God, but Feaſted on by us; and ſo not a Sacrifice, but a Sacrificiall Feaſt: Which beganne too ſoone to be miſunderſtood.

CHAP. VI.

I Should now come, to make ſome further improvement of this Generall *Notion of the Lords Supper*: By ſhewing what theſe Feaſts upon the Sacrifices did ſignifie, under the Law; and then applying the ſame in a more perfect manner to the Lords Supper under the Goſpell; being warranted thereunto by that Analogy which is betweene them. But becauſe there may be divers gloſſes and Interpretations of Theſe Feaſts upon the Sacrifices, which are obvious to every common underſtanding; We will decline them all, and pitch onely upon one, which is not ſo vulgarly underſtood. And it is this, that, *The Eating of Gods Sacrifices* was a FEDERALL RITE, betweene God and thoſe that offered them, according to the Cuſtome of the Ancients, and eſpecially in thoſe Orientall Parts, to Confirme and Ratify their Covenants, by Eating and Drinking together.

Thus

Thus when *Iſaak* made a Covenant with *Abimelech* the King of *Gerar*, the Text ſaith, *He made him and thoſe that came with him a Feaſt*, and *they did eate and drinke, and roſe up betimes in the morning and ſware to one another.* When *Laban* made a *Covenant* with *Jacob*, *Gen.* 21. ver. 44. *Now therefore come* (ſaith *Laban*) *let us make a Covenant, I and thou, and let it be for a witneſſe betweene me and thee*; Then it followes in the Text, *They tooke ſtones, and made a heape, and did eate there upon the heape, and Laban called it* JEGARSAHADUTHA, *in his Chalday Tongue, but Jakob* (in the Hebrew Language) GALEED, *i. e. A heape of witneſſe.* Implying that thoſe ſtones upon which they had eaten and drunke together, ſhould be a witneſſe againſt either of them that ſhould firſt violate that Covenant. *R. Moſes Bar Nachman* in his Comment, thus gloſſeth upon this place, אכלו שם מעט לזכרון שהוא דרך באים בברית לאכול שניהם מלחם אחד לחברה ולאהבה ואחרי בואם בשבועה ובברית זבח ועשה להם כרה גדולה *i. e. They did eate there, a little upon the heape, for a Memoriall: Becauſe it was the manner of thoſe that entred into Covenant, to eate both together of the ſame Bread, as a Symbol of love and friendſhip:* And *Iſaak Abrabanel* much to the ſame purpoſe, היה מנהג בניהם שהאוכלים להם על שלחן אחד יחשבו להם לאחים נאמנים. *i.e.* It was an ancient cuſtome amongſt them, that they which did eate Bread together upon the ſame Table, ſhould be accounted ever afterward as entire Brethren. And in this ſenſe he conceiveth, that place, *Lamentations* 5. v. 6.

may be expounded: *We have given the hand to the Egyptians, and to the Assyrians by fulneſſe of Bread, i. e.* We have made a Covenant with them. *Joſhua* 9. verſe 14. When the *Gibeonites* came to the *Iſraelites*, and deſired them to make a league with them, it is ſaid; *The Men of Iſrael tooke of their victuals and asked not counſell of the mouth of the Lord:* that is, they made a Covenant with them, as *Kimchy* learnedly expounds it, לקחו מציידם ואכלו ממנו בבריח כדי שיבטוח בהם, *Acceperunt de Viatico ipſorum, & comederunt cum illis per modum fœderis.* For ſo it followes afterward in the Text, *And Joſhuah made peace with them.* Hence alſo was that Emphaticall expreſſion, *Pſalm.* 41. 10. ſpoken literally by *David* of *Achitophel*, *Mine owne familiar friend, that did eate of my Bread, hath lift up the heele againſt me:* but ſeeming prophetically, to glance at *Judas*, that dipping with Chriſt in the ſame diſh, betrayed him. The Singular Emphaſis of which ſpeech, we that are unacquainted with this Cuſtome of the Orientall Nations, cannot eaſily perceive; neither can wee any where better learne it, then from that paſſage of *Celſus* in *Origen*, who carping at that Hiſtory of *Judas* his betraying Chriſt, in the Goſpell, as an incredible thing; made in the meane while, an excellent Comment upon this Prophecy, when he little thought of it. Οτι ἀνθρώπῳ μὲν ὁ κοινωνήσας τραπέζης, ἵνα αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλεύσειε. πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὁ θεῷ συνευωχηθείς, ἵνα αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλεύσειεν. *i. e. Si homini nemo inſidiaretur, ejuſdem menſæ particeps, multò minus Deo.* And *Origens* Reply to him, which ſhewes that though this were

an

an unuſuall thing, yet it ſometime came to paſſe, is very pregnant alſo for our purpoſe: Τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι πολλοὶ κοινωνήσαντες ἁλὸς καὶ τραπέζης, ἐπεβούλευσαν τοῖς συνεστίοις καὶ πάρης ἐστὶ ἡ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Βαρβάρων ἱστορία τοιούτων παραδειγμάτων. Καὶ ὀνειδίζων γε ὁ Πάριος Ἰαμβόποιος τὴν Λυκάμβαντα μετὰ ἁλὸς καὶ τραπέζης συνθήκας ἀθετήσαντα, φησὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν. Ὅρκον δὲ ἐπορκίσας μέγαν, ἁλὸς τε καὶ τραπέζαν. *i. e. Quis ignorat multos ad Communionem Salis & Menſæ adhibitos, inſidiatos tamen ſuis contubernalibus? Plena eſt Hiſtoria tam Græcorum, quam Barbarorum, exemplis ejuſmodi. Et Parius ille Iamborum Scriptor, exprobrans Lycambæ violatum fœdus, quod Sal & Menſa conciliaverat, ſic eum alloquitur. Sacramentum irritaſti magnum, Salem atque Menſam.* All which makes manifeſt, what an hainous offence it was accounted anciently, to be guilty of the breach of a Covenant, which had beene confirmed by Eating and Drinking together. In the ſeventh verſe of *Obadiah*, that Prophet ſpeakes to *Edom* in this manner, *All the men of thy confederacy have brought thee to the border, the men that were at peace with thee have deceived thee, they that eate thy Bread, have laid a wound under thee.* In the New Teſtament, that place, *Iohn* the fourth, verſe the ninth, is well obſerved by *Heinſius* in his *Ariſtarchus* to carry this notion: *How is it that thou being a Jew askeſt drinke of me, being a Woman of Samaria? Suaviſſimè dictum* (ſaith that forenamed Criticke) *ex eorum more qui cùm peregrini eſſent, aut alieno fuiſſent animo, animis conciliandis cibum mutuò ac potum alter alterius guſtabant.*

Wherefore I thinke from all theſe inſtances, I may conclude that this is the true Etymon of that

Hebrew word ברית, which ſignifies a *Covenant*, or any Federall Communion betwixt parties, from ברה *Comedere*, becauſe it was the conſtant cuſtome of the Hebrewes and Orientall Nations, to eſtabliſh Covenants by eating and drinking together, as hath beene ſhewed.

And, as the Jewes, ſo likewiſe did the Heathens in the ſame manner uſe to Ratifie their Covenants, betweene Parties, by *Eating together*. *Lucian* in *Toxaris*, reports it of the Scythians, That when any one was injured and could not revenge himſelfe, the manner was, that he ſhould kill an Oxe, and cut it into ſmall peeces, which being boyled, he was to ſit downe by them, with his hands behind him, (which was a geſture of earneſt ſupplication amongſt them) and then whoſoever was minded to helpe him, came, and did Eate a piece of his fleſh, and ſo, with this Ceremony promiſed to aſſiſt him. And this was counted a ſacred and inviolable Covenant of mutuall defence betweene them, whence that Greeke Proverbe, Ἐπὶ βόρου ἐκάθιζετο, *In tergore bovis deſedit*, of which *Eraſmus* in his *Adagies*. *Herodotus* reporteth of the *Perſians*, that they made their Leagues and Covenants at Feaſts: and of the *Naſamones* a People of *Lybia*, that they compoſed Peace, by ſtretching out a Cup full of Wine to each other, and pledging one another in it. *Alexander ab Alexand.* relates this of the *Thracians* and *Egyptians*, that, *E cornibus boum (quæ veteribus poculorum loco erant) Vina ſibi invicem propinantes, id firmiſſimum contracti fœderis vinculum eſſe putabant.* *Curtius* Reporteth of the *Macedonians*,

nians, Quod patrio ritu fœdus quod ſanctiſsimum vellent haberi, ſic ineabant, Ut panem gladio diviſum uterque libaret. And therefore *Alexander* when he fell in love with *Roxana,* commanded Bread forthwith to be brought before him, which when he had divided with his ſword, and they had both taſted together of, he tooke her preſently to himſelfe as his Wife. And there remaineth a Cuſtome to this day, ſomething like this, at Weddings in many Countries; That when the Bridegroome and Bride are come from Church, they have a piece of Cake brought them, which when the Bridegroom hath taſted, he gives it to the Bride to taſte of likewiſe, in token of a Covenant betweene them.

The *Germans* ſtill uſe to conclude of Bargaines, and Ratifie Friendſhip betweene Parties by drinking together, as appeareth by that phraſe which they have **Den friden Trinchen,** *Pacem bibere.*

The Emperour of *Ruſsia* to this day, when he would ſhew extraordinary Grace and favour unto any, ſends them Bread and Salt from his Table. And when he invited Baron *Sigiſmond,* the Emperour *Ferdinands* Embaſſador, he did it in this forme, *Sigiſmunde comedes ſal & panem noſtrum nobiſcum:* as *Sigiſmond* himſelfe relates it in his *Muſcovian* Commentaries. It is an Axiom in the Civill Law, that if a man drinke to one, againſt whom he hath an Accuſation of ſlander, or other Verball injury, he loſes his Action, becauſe it is ſuppoſed he is reconciled to him.

In like manner, I ſay, the Eating of Sacrifices,

which were Gods meate, was a Federall Rite, betweene God and those that did partake of them, and signifyed that there was a Covenant of Friend-ship betweene him and them.

For the better conceiving whereof, we must observe, that Sacrifices, beside the Nature of expiation, had the Notion of Feasts, which God himselfe did, as it were, feed upon. Which I explaine thus: When God had brought the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, resolving to manifest himselfe in a peculiar manner present among them, He thought good *to Dwell amongst them* in a visible and Externall manner: And therefore while they were in the Wilderneſse and sojourned in Tents, he would have a *Tent or Tabernacle* built, to sojourne with them also. This Mystery of the Tabernacle was fully understood by the Learned *Nachmanides*, who in few words, but pregnant, thus expresseth it: עקר הרוצן במשכן הוא מקום מנוחת השכינה: And againe, סוד המשכן הוא שיהיה הכבוד אשר שכן על חר כיני שוכן עליו: That is, *The Mystery of the Tabernacle, was this, that it was to be a Place for the Shechinah, or Habitation of Divinity to be fixed in:* And this, no doubt, as a speciall Type of Gods future *Dwelling* in Christs humane Nature, which was the True Shechinah. But when the Jewes were come into their Land, and had there built them Houses, God intended to have a fixed Dwelling-House also, and therefore his Moveable Tabernacle was to be turned into a Standing Temple. Whence by imitation came

all

came all those Temples among the Heathens, which they apprehended as so many places of Peculiar Residence or Habitation, for their Deities next the Heavens to dwell in. As appeares by that of *Silius* amongst many others,

——*Tarpeie Pater, qui Templa secundam*
Incolis à Cœlo sedem ——

Now the Tabernacle or Temple, being thus as a *House* for God to *Dwell* in visibly, to make up the *Notion* of *Dwelling* or *Habitation* compleate, there must be all things sutable to a House, belonging to it. Hence in the Holy Place, there must be a *Table* and a *Candlesticke*, because this was the ordinary furniture of a roome, as the fore-commended *Nachmanides* observes, סמך השלחן והמנורה שהם כלים כמותו וידוע על ענין המשכן. *i. e. He addeth a Table and a Candlesticke, because these suite the Notion of a Dwelling-House.* The *Table* must have its *Dishes*, and *Spoones*, and *Bowles*, and *Covers* belonging to it, though they were never used, and alwayes be furnished with *Bread* upon it. The *Candlesticke* must have its *Lamps* conninually burning.

Hence also there must be a *Continuall Fire* kept, in this House of Gods, upon the Altar, as the *Focus* of it; to which Notion, I conceive, the Prophet *Esay* doth allude Chap. 31. ver. 9. אשר אור לו בציון ותנור בירושלים: which I would thus translate, *Qui habet ignem suum in Sion, & focum suum in Jerusalem.* And besides all this, to carry the *Notion* still further, there must be some *Constant Meate and Provision* brought into this House, which was done in the Sacrifices, that were partly consumed

ſumed by Fire upon Gods owne Altar, and partly eaten by the Prieſts which were Gods *Family*, and therefore to be maintained by him; That which was conſumed upon Gods Altar, was accounted GODS MESSE, as appeareth from the firſt chap. of *Malachy*; Where the *Altar* is called GODS TABLE, and the *Sacrifice* upon it GODS MEAT; *You ſay the Table of God is polluted, and the fruit thereof his Meat is contemptible*: and often in the Law, the Sacrifice is called Gods לחמ, that is, his *Bread or Food*. Whence in that Learned Hebrew Booke *Cozri*, The King *Haber* objects to the Jew *Cozar* againſt his Religion, that it ſeemed to place Corporeity in God, in making him to feed upon the Fleſh of Beaſts in theſe Sacrifices: to which the Jewiſh Doctor replieth Cabaliſtically in this manner: That as in men, Corporeal meate is a meanes to unite and continue the Soule (which is a Spirit) to the Body: So in the Land of *Iſrael*, the Bloud of Beaſts offered up in Sacrifice, had an Attractive power to draw downe Divinity, and unite it to the Jewes. And methinkes this may be a little further convinced from that paſſage in the 50. *Pſal. If I were hungry, I would not tell thee, for the world is mine, and the fulneſſe thereof: Will I eate the Fleſh of Buls, or Drinke the the Bloud of Goates?* For though it be here denied that God did really feed upon the Sacrifices, yet it is implyed there was ſome ſuch Alluſive Signification in them.

Wherefore it is further obſervable, that beſide the fleſh of the beaſt offered up in Sacrifice, there was a Mincah or Meat-offering, made of Flowre and Oyle,

Oyle, and a Libamen, or Drink-offering, that was alwayes joyned with the daily Sacrifice. As the *Bread* and *Drink* which was to go along with Gods *Meate*.

It was also strictly commanded, that there should be Salt in every Sacrifice and oblation: Because all Meate is unsavory without Salt, as *R. Moses Bar Nachman* hath here also well observed, מפני שאינו דרך כבוד לחיות לחם השם שפל מבלי מלח. i.e. Because it was not honourable, that Gods Meate should be unsavory, without Salt.

Lastly, all these things were to be consumed on the Altar, onely by the Holy Fire that came downe from Heaven, because they were *Gods Portion*, and therefore to be *eaten* or consumed by himselfe, in an extraordinary manner. And this the Devill sometime imitated, in some Sacrifices offered up to him. For so I understand that Passage of *Pindar* in his *Olympiacks*, *Ode* 7. speaking of the Rhodians, That when they had prepared, and were come to offer Sacrifice to *Jupiter*, they had by chance forgotten to bring Fire with them: But *Jupiter* being conscious of their good intentions, rained downe upon them A Golden Shovvre, that is, (as I understand it) A Shovvre of Fire. A pure imitation of the Sacred Story. Take it in that elegant Poets owne words.

Κάτπε γὰ ἀιθύσας ἔχοντες
Σπέρμ' ἀνέβαν φλόγος ὕ,
Τεῦξαν δ' ΑΠΤΡΟΙΣ ΙΕΡΟΙΣ,

Αλσος ἐν ἀκροπόλει Κύπρου μὲν
Ξανθὸν ἀγαλὸν πυρίλαι,
Πολὺν δὲ χρύσον.

That is, according to *Benedictus* his Metaphraſe: *Etenim Rhodii aſcenderunt, quamvis non habentes ardentis ſemen ignis. Verum dum inſtruunt Sacrificiis igni carentibus, aram in aroe, illis quidem flavam adducens nebulam, multum pluit* [*Jupiter*] *aurum.*

And *Solinus* reports it of the *Vulcanian* Hill in *Sicily*, that they which offered Sacrifice upon it, never put fire to it, but expected it ſhould be kindled from Heaven. His Words according to *Salmaſius's* Edition, are theſe, *Nec longè indè Collis Vulcanius, in quo qui divina rei operantur, ligna vitea ſuper aras ſtruunt: nec Ignis adponitur in hanc congeriem. Cum proſicias intulerunt, ſi adeſt Deus, ſi ſacrum probatur, Sarmenta licet viridia, ſponte concipiunt, & nullo inflagrante halitu, ab ipſo numine ſit accendium. Ibi Epulantes adludit flamma, quæ flexuoſis exceſſibus vagabunda, quem contigerit non aduxit: nec aliud eſt quã imago nuncia perfecti ritè Voti.* The place is very remarkable, & where he faies thus, *Epulantes adludit flamma*; he alludeth to that cuſtome of Feaſting on the Sacrifices, which was before explained.

I will adde to all this, the words of a late learned Author, that ſometime ſtumbled unawares upon this very *Notion*, which we are now about, and yet expreſt it happily in this manner, *Deus ad ſuam cum populo Judæorum familiaritatem ſignificandam, ſibi ab illo carnes, ſanguinem, atque fruges, in* Altari *atque* Mensa *offerri voluit, ut oſtenderet ſe quaſi*

Com-

COMMUNEM *in illo populo Habere* MENSAM, *esse illius* CONVIVAM *perpetuum, atque ita familiariter cum illis habitare.*

And as it was thus among the Hebrewes, so it seemes that *Sacrifices* had the Notion of Feasts likewise among the ancient Persians, that worshipped the Fire: of whom *Maximus Tyrius* thus relateth, Ον εισφερουσι ποτε τοις θεοις ειωθασιν, ὃν δη Πυρα ἐστι, *i.e. Bringing in the Sacrifices to the Fire, which was their God, they were wont to say,* Ignis Domine Comede.

The Sacrifices then being Gods Feasts, they that did partake of them, must needs be His CONVIVAE, and in a manner EATE and DRINKE with him. And that this did bear the Notion of a Federall Rite, in the Scriptures account, I prove from that place, *Levit.* 2. 13. *Thou shalt not suffer the* SALT OF THE COVENANT *of thy God to be lacking, with all thine offerings thou shalt offer Salt.* Where the Salt that was to be cast upon all the Sacrifices, is called THE SALT OF THE COVENANT, to signifie, that as men did use to make Covenants by Eating and Drinking together, whereto *Salt* is a necessary *Appendix*; so God by these Sacrifices and the Feasts upon them, did Ratifie and Confirme his Covenant with those that did partake of them, in as much as they did in a manner EATE and DRINKE with him.

For Salt was ever accounted amongst the ancients, a most necessary Concomitant of Feasts, and Condiment of all Meats: כל סעודה שאין מלח בה אין בה ממש, saith the Jewish Proverb, in *Berachoth*, *Omne Convivium in quo non est salitum non est convivium.*

vium. And therefore, because Covenants and Reconciliations were made by Eating and Drinking, where Salt was alwayes used, Salt it selfe was accounted among the ancients, AMICITIAE SYMBOLUM; ἅλες καὶ τράπεζα, *Sal & Mensa*, was used proverbially among the Greekes to expresse friendship by; Ἅλας καὶ τράπεζαν παραβαίνειν, in the words of *Origen* before quoted, out of *Archilochus*, *Sal & Mensam transgredi*, was to violate the most Sacred League of friendship. *Æschines* in his Oration *De perperam habita Legatione*, hath a Passage very pertinent to this purpose, Τὰς γὰρ τῶν πόλεων ἅλας καὶ δημοσίαν τράπεζαν οἱ πλεῖστον ἀξιοῦντες ποιεῖσθαι. *Etenim Civitatis Sales & communem mensam, ait, se plurimi facere debere.* Thus I understand that Symboll of *Pythagoras*, τὸ ἅλα μεσπίδοις, (by *Erasmus* his leave) *for friendship and hospitality.* There is a pregnant instance of this very Phrase in the Scripture, *Ezra* 4. 14. Where our Translatours read it thus, *Because we have maintenance from the Kings Palace.* But the words in the Chaldee runne after this manner, בגין דמלחא מלחנא מלח היכלא דמלכא, *Quod Sale Palatii Salivimus*, *Because we have eaten of the Kings salt*, [that is, because we have engaged our selves in a Covenant of Friendship to him, by eating of his Meate:] *therefore it is not meete for us to see the Kings dishonour.* That Proverb mentioned in *Tully* makes to this purpose, *Multos modios Salis simul edendis esse ut amicitiae munus completum sit.* Which yes, because that Federall Symboll had beene so often abused. Nay, hence there remaineth a Superstitious custome amongst us and

other Nations, to this day; To count the Overturning of the Salt upon the Table Ominous, as betiding some evill to him towards whom it fals: *Quia Sal amoris & amicitiæ Symbolum.* And by this time I thinke, I have given a sufficient Comment upon מלח הברית, *The Salt of the Covenant* in the Text.

Only I must not forget, that as in Gods Sacrifices, there was ever Salt to be used; So the like was generally observed in the Heathen Sacrifices; as that one place out of *Pliny*, amongst many, shall sufficiently testifie, *Maxima Salis authoritas è Sacris veterum intelligitur, apud quos nulla sacra sine molâ salsâ conficiebantur.* And the reason of it also is thus given by that famous Scholiast, upon *Il.* ā. διότι ἐστὶ ἀλλοφιλίας σύμβολον, Because Salt is a Symboll of friendship: which is the same with that reason given by God, why he would always have Salt in his Sacrifices, because it was מלח הברית, that is, *Sal Symbolum fœderis*, as before was shewen. And this Phrase being thus explained, will clearely expound that other Phrase, about which Criticks have laboured so much in vaine, where the same words are used, but inverted, and a Covenant is called *A covenant of Salt*, as Salt is here called *The Salt of the Covenant*, *Numb.* 18. 19. and 2 *Chron.* 13. 5. *viz.* Because Covenants were established by Eating and Drinking together, where Salt was alwayes a necessary Appendix.

Now therefore, that we may returne; As the Legall Sacrifices, with the Feasts upon those Sacrifices, were

God and Men: In like manner I say The Lords Supper under the Gospel, which we have already proved to be EPULUM SACRIFICIALE, *A Feast upon Sacrifice*, must needs be EPULUM FOEDERALE, *A Feast of Amity and Friendship*, betweene God and Men. Where by Eating and Drinking at Gods owne Table, and of his Meate, we are taken into a sacred Covenant, and inviolable League of friendship with him.

Which I will confirme from that fore-commended place, whence I have already proved that the Lords Supper is *A Feast upon Sacrifice*. For there the Apostle thus dehorts the Corinthians from Eating of the Feasts upon Idoll-Sacrifices, which are a Parallel to the Feast upon the Christian Sacrifice, in the Lords Supper, Because this was to have *Fellowship*, and *Federall Communion* with Devils; *The things that the Gentiles Sacrifice, they Sacrifice to Devils, and not to God, and I would not Brethren, that you should have* FELLOWSHIP (or COMMUNION, κοινωνους) *with Devils*. Where the Comment of Saint *Chrysostome* is excellent to our purpose: Ει γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώποις τὸ κοινωνεῖν ἄλλων ἡ τραπέζης, φιλίας δεῖγμα καὶ σύμβολον γίνεται, ἐγγυᾶται καὶ ἐν δαιμόσι τὸν αὐτὸν νομίσαι. *That is, if among men to communicate of Bread and Salt, be a token and Symboll of friendship, it must carry the same Notion betweene men and Devils, in the Idoll-Feasts.* If therefore to Eate the Sacrifice of Devils be to have *Federall Communion* with those Devils, to whom it was offered, then to Eate of the Sacrifice of Christ, once offered up to God, in the Lords Supper, is to have *Federall Communion* with God.

There is an excellent Story in *Maimonides* his *Moreh Nevochim*, concerning an ancient customs of the *Zabii*: Of Feasting together with their Gods in this Federall way, which will much illustrate this Notion. For going about to give the reason, why the Eating of Blood was forbidden in the Law, he fetches it from that Idolatrous use of it then in *Moses* time among the *Zabii*, according to his Principles, who thought the reason of all the Ceremonial Precepts was to be fetched from some such accidentall Grounds, because those Laws were not *Prima*, but *Secundæ intentionis* in God. *Multarum legum rationes & causa* (saith he) *mihi immotuerunt ex cognitione fidei, rituum, & cultus Zabiorum.*

By these *Zabii*, he meanes the ancient *Chaldeans*; the Word in the Originall Arabicke, according to the Copy of *Joseph Scaliger*, being thus written, صبئون; *A Vento Apeliote sic dicti*, (as he * observes) *quasi dicas Orientales*. And that Booke which *Maimonides* so often quoteth, concerning that Nation, their Rites, and Religion, is still extant among the *Mahumetane Arabians*, as the same *Scaliger* avoucheth. The Story then is this, according to the Hebrew Translation of *R. Abben Tibbon*, Lib. 3. cap. 46.

* *In Epist. 62. ad Isacum Casaubonum.*

דע כי הדם הזה טמא מאד בעיני הצאבה ועם כל זה היו אוכלים אותו מעצי שדיו ותשתיהם שהוא מוזן השדים וכשאכל אותו מי שאכלו כבר חשתחוה עם השדים ויבואוהו ויהיעוהו העהידות כמו שיזמו חחמין ממעשי השדים. *i. e. Licet Sanguis impurus & immundus admodum fuerit in oculis Zabiorum, tamen*

tamen ab illis comestus fuerit, eò quòd existimarunt CORIUM HUNC ESSE DAEMONEM, *& quòd is qui eum comedit, hâc ratione* COMMUNICATIONEM *aliquam cum Dæmonibus haberet: ità ut familiariter cum illo conversentur, & futura ei aperiant.* But because others of them did abhorre the eating of blood, as a thing repugnant unto Nature, they performed this service in a little different manner;

וחו טם אנשים שוחה קשה בעיניהם
אכילת הדם כי חוא דבר שימאסהו טבע האדם
וחו שוחטים בחמה ומקבלים דמו בכלי או בחפורה
ואוכלים בטר חשחושח החיא סביב דמה וחיו מומין
במעשה וזה שחשדים יאכלו הדם אשר וזא
מוב והם יאכלו הבשר ובזה תזיה האהבה
וחאחוה וחרשת בהם בעבור שאכלו כלם על שלחן
אחד ובמושב אחד ויבאו להם טדים חם לפי
מזמנתם בחלום ויגידו להם העתידות ויועילו להם

i. e. Mactantes Bestiam aliquam, Sanguinem in circulo sedentes comedebant: imaginantes sibi in hoc opere, ipsis CARNEM COMEDENTIBUS, *Dæmones* ILLUM SANGVINEM COMEDERE, *& hunc esse* IPSORUM CIBUM, *hocque medio* AMICITIAM, FRATERNITATEM *&* FAMILIARITATEM *inter ipsos contrahi, quia omnes in unâ mensâ edunt, uno consessu accumbunt.*

As for the former part of this Story, I finde it also in *R. Moses Bar Nachman*, upon *Deuteron.* 12. 23. Where he goes about to give the reason why blood was forbidden in the Law, as *Maymonides* did, although in the first place, he saith, it was because

Blood

Blood served in the Sacrifices for expiation, otherwise then *Maymonides*; (for there was a great Controversie betweene these two Doctors, about the Nature of Sacrifices) but yet in the Second place, he brings in this also; Because it was used superstitiously by the Heathens in the Worship of their Idoll-Gods, והיתה העבודה היא באכילה מן הזבח כי היו מקבצים הדם לשדים והם אוכלים עליו וממנו כאילו הם קרואים לשדים לאכל על שלחן השדים הדם ומחברים עמהם וחגה היו מתנבאים בו ומגידים עתידות i. e.

They performed their Superstitious Worship, by eating of Blood in this manner; They gathered together Blood for the Devils their Idoll-Gods, and then they came themselves, and did eate of that blood with them: As being the Devils Guests, *and* Invited *to* Eate *at the* Table *of Devils, and so were* Joyned *in Federall Society with them. And by this kind of Communion with Devils, they were able to Prophecy, and foretell things to come.*

FINIS.